















PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
ANTI-MAYNOOTH CONFERENCE  
OF 1845.

WITH AN HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION, AND AN APPENDIX.

COMPILED AND EDITED  
(AT THE REQUEST OF THE CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE,)

BY THE  
REV. A. S. THELWALL, M.A.  
OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

---

LONDON :  
PUBLISHED BY SEELEY, BURNSIDE, AND SEELEY; HAMILTON,  
ADAMS, AND Co.; JACKSON AND WALFORD;  
AND J. NISBET AND Co.

---

1845.

LONDON:  
BLACKBURN AND PARDON, PRINTERS,  
HATTON GARDEN.

## TO THE READER.

---

HAVING been requested by the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee to undertake the editing of the subsequent Report, and to draw up an Historical Introduction, comprising a survey of the recent struggle, I entered upon that work with very little idea of the time and toil that it would require. The Report of the Conference itself was taken in Short-hand by Mr. H. FINDON,—that of the Meeting in Exeter Hall, on May 1st, by Mr. MERRETT; and this part of the work will, I trust, be found satisfactory to the Reader: nothing is, I hope, omitted which could be deemed important; nothing retained which, in due consideration to the various speakers, it was not desirable to retain. But, on this subject, more need not be said than will be found in the Introduction, pp. xciii. xciv.; and in the few remarks at the commencement of the Appendix.

But with regard to the Historical Introduction, I am by no means satisfied. To make it what I could have wished it to be, would have required the additional labour of three or four months: but I was limited as to time; and my time was only partially at my own disposal. I trust, however, that every important document is preserved, and inserted in its place. Some things may have escaped me,—though I was a very regular labourer, from first to last, both in the Central Committee and in the Executive Committee; and from other members of the Committee I have received kind assistance and very useful hints. Many

things might, with great advantage, have been abridged or retrenched, had the opportunity been afforded of carefully revising the whole, before any part went to press.

I will only add, at the request of the Committee, that *the whole of the Editorial and Literary responsibility rests upon myself*. With a deep sense of the imperfections of my work, I cast myself upon the Christian kindness of my Protestant Readers. I will only add, that I have earnestly endeavoured to keep before me continually, *the Principles of Protestant Union* on which the Committee was formed, and on which all its operations were conducted. Into those Principles, I most fully and cordially entered. Under the influence of those Principles, and with an earnest desire to maintain and promote them, I have written. My own principles, as a very decided Churchman, are, I believe, well known. But, whatever may be the case with others, my Protestantism rises far above my Churchmanship; and I desire to hold all that pertains to things Ecclesiastical, in due subservience to Evangelical Doctrines and Spiritual Truth. If there be either Churchmen or Dissenters, who hold their peculiar principles *as such*, to be more important than their common Protestantism, or act as if they did, I—for my part—must take leave, to have a very unfavourable opinion of their Christianity.

To the earnest prayers and Christian kindness of all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, I commend myself,

And remain,

their faithful servant in the bonds of the Gospel,

THE EDITOR.

Sept. 25, 1845.

# CONTENTS.

---

	Page
<b>HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.</b>	
Announcement of the Ministerial Plan, Feb. 4th .....	v
Preliminary Meeting of Protestants, Feb. 25th .....	vii
Mr. Plumptre's Address.....	vii
First Meeting in Exeter Hall, March 18th .....	xi
Address of the Central Committee, March 28th .....	xvii
<i>First Reading</i> of the Bill, April 3rd .....	xix
Division .....	xxiii
Attempts to gain time .....	xxvii
<i>Second Reading</i> of the Bill, April 11th—19th.....	xxxiii
Public Meeting in the City of London, April 14th .....	xxxv
Great Meeting in Covent Garden Theatre .....	xxxvii
Meetings in the Country, and in the Metropolis.....	xlix
Duke of Newcastle's Address .....	lii
<i>Journal des Débats</i> of April 14th .....	liii
Division on Second Reading .....	lxiv
Address of Committee, April 19th—CONFERENCE proposed .....	lxxi
Adjourned Meeting in Exeter Hall, April 22nd .....	lxxiv
Election for West Kent .....	lxxvi
Division on Mr. Ward's Motion .....	lxxvii
Meeting of the Wesleyans, April 25th .....	lxxxv
Address of Lords Winchilsea and Kenyon, &c. ....	lxxxviii
Sir Robert Peel in 1838.....	xci
<b>THE CONFERENCE</b> .....	xcii
Convention of Protestant Dissenters.....	xcviii
May Meetings .....	cv
Correspondence of Rev. R. J. M'Ghee with Sir R. Peel .....	cviii
<i>Third Reading</i> , May 19th .....	cxiii
Division, May 21st.....	cxv
Proceedings and Address of the Anti-Maynooth Committee, May 26th..	cxxii
Anti-Maynooth Movement in Ireland .....	cxxv

	Page
<i>Second Reading in the House of Lords, June 2nd</i> .....	c xxxviii
Division, June 4th.....	cliv
Meeting in Exeter Hall to Address the Queen, June 4th .....	clvii
Speech of Rev. J. Cumming, D.D. ....	clx
Speech of Rev. R. J. M'Ghee .....	clxvii
<i>Third Reading in the House of Lords, June 16th</i> .....	clxxviii
Presentation of Addresses to the Queen .....	clxxx
Concluding Remarks .....	clxxxiii
Resolution of the Committee.....	clxxxiii
Invitation to Conference on the subject of Christian Union, and Reply..	clxxxvi
 <b>REPORT OF CONFERENCE.</b>	
First Sitting, Wednesday Morning, April 30th .....	1
Second Sitting, Wednesday Evening .....	37
Third Sitting, Thursday, May 1st .....	69
Fourth Sitting, Friday, May 2nd.....	106
<i>Letter of Dr. Chalmers</i> .....	137
Fifth and Last Sitting, Saturday, May 3rd.....	140
 <b>APPENDIX</b> .....	
Meeting in Exeter Hall, Thursday Evening, May 1st .....	178
List of Deputies .....	219
Abstract and Analysis of Places .....	231



## HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

---

THE Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, having been charged with the office of publishing a Report of the Proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference, which was held in London, April 30th to May 3rd of this year, feel that they should but imperfectly acquit themselves of the duty imposed upon them, if they did not prefix to that Report some account of the circumstances which led to the calling of that Conference, and which were connected with it. And this account will best be given in the form of a brief history of the recent struggle—the struggle in which Protestants of all denominations have been engaged—in opposition to the Endowment of the Romish College of Maynooth.

On Tuesday, the 4th of February, the Session of Parliament, which has just now closed, was opened by Her Majesty in person; and the speech from the Throne contained the following paragraph among others :—

“I recommend to your favourable consideration the policy of improving and extending the opportunities of Academical Education in Ireland.”

This was sufficiently vague and indefinite; but, in the debate in the House of Commons, on the Address in answer to Her Majesty's speech, the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. for Newark,—who had previously resigned his office as President of the Board of Trade and Master of the Mint,—came forward (in consequence of some remarks which fell from Lord John Russell) and stated, that his retirement from office had taken place, in consequence of measures which were proposed by Government in reference to the College of Maynooth. He had, some years ago, written a book, in which he had stated, in a form the most detailed and the most deliberate, the views which he believed to be most conformable to the relations of a Christian State to the profession of Religion, and to policy with regard to Religion. And the question was, whether, after what he had declared, and especially taking into view the manner of declaring it, it would have been right, or would

have served in any degree the credit of the proposal of the Right Hon. Gentleman, (Sir Robert Peel,) that he should remain in office as a Minister of the Crown? He had felt it to be his painful duty to sever himself from men, with whom and under whom, he had long acted in public life : he thought it a matter of deference and duty to the public, that he should quit his office, though he had no blame to cast on his Right Hon. Friend and his Government, with respect to any dereliction of their character or intentions.

Hereupon, Sir Robert Peel rose to explain his intentions, and said, in reference to this particular subject,—

“We do intend to make a proposition to this House; and I will frankly state, on the first day of the Session, that it is our intention to propose to Parliament a liberal increase of the Vote for the College of Maynooth. . . . And I beg to state, with equal distinctness, that we do not propose to accompany that increased Vote by any regulations in respect of the doctrines and discipline of the Church of Rome, that can diminish the grace and favour of the Grant.”

Such was the first public announcement of the designs of the Government with regard to the Endowment of Maynooth. This was presently followed by strong expressions of regret at the course adopted by the Right Hon. Baronet, from J. P. Plumptre, Esq. the Member for East Kent, who warned the Government, that this announcement would create a considerable sensation; that this course of conciliation would prove an ineffectual course; and that concession had ever been the fruitful parent of demand, and would but lead to more concessions afterwards. In these views, Sir R. H. Inglis, Bart., M.P. for the University of Oxford, concurred, and pointed out, that Mr. Sheil himself had plainly declared, that the measure proposed would not satisfy him or his fellow-countrymen.

Under these circumstances the Ministerial Proposal came under the notice of British Protestants. The full extent of the plan, and even the true nature of the measure, were yet unknown, and very imperfectly surmised; but immediate attention was excited and opposition roused. “The Record” newspaper took up the subject without delay; and, in a series of able articles,—commencing with its next publication, Feb. 6th,—first demolished the notion of a Compact, and then pointed out some of the prominent evils of the system of instruction,—urged the necessity of immediate and active opposition,—and showed in what manner that opposition might be carried on, so as to be most likely to prove effectual. “The Patriot” had also several very strong leading articles on the subject. “The Watchman,” which is more especially the medium through which the Wesleyan Committee of Privileges is accustomed to communicate with the numerous and highly respectable body in the Wesleyan Connexion, soon commenced a series of well-timed and

able leading articles on the question. These were afterwards "published by request," under the title of "Maynooth College ; its Teaching and its Endowment," in a tract which contains as much authentic information and sound argument on the subject as could well be compressed into the space which it occupies. This was, doubtless, eminently useful in promoting the vigorous and united movement of the Wesleyan body in opposition to the measure.

The Committee of the Protestant Association also immediately took the subject into consideration, and, by a resolution passed on the 20th of February, agreed to call a Preliminary Meeting in the large Committee Room, No. 6, Exeter Hall,—for the purpose of endeavouring to unite all Protestants in opposition to a measure, which evidently tended to involve the whole Nation in the guilt of directly sanctioning and supporting Popery in its worst form. That Meeting was accordingly held on Tuesday, February 25th, J. P. Plumptre, Esq., M.P., in the Chair, when it was unanimously resolved,—

"That the following be a standing Committee, to meet at No. 11, Exeter Hall, at two o'clock each Tuesday and Friday, to concert and carry out plans for a more united and general opposition to the proposed increased Grant to Maynooth College :

"J. P. Plumptre, Esq., M.P., G. J. P. Smith, Esq., Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel, R. B. Seeley, Esq., T. Hamilton, Esq., J. A. Knipe, Esq., Rev. A. S. Thelwall, Rev. T. Tenison Cuffe, George Finch, Esq., Rev. C. Prest, J. C. Evans, Esq., John Wood, Esq., Rev. J. E. Cox, Rev. G. Campbell, John Bridges, Esq., Josiah Conder, Esq., Rev. J. Blackburn, Mr. Goad, Rev. H. Robbins, Rev. D. Vawdrey, Rev. James Hamilton."

It was immediately proposed by this Committee, to hold a Public Meeting of Protestant Christians of all Denominations; and a correspondence was opened with many influential individuals, who had previously distinguished themselves in the cause of Protestantism. It was finally arranged that this Meeting should take place at Exeter Hall on the 18th of March; and, in the mean time, Mr. Plumptre published the following Address :—

"TO THE PROTESTANTS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

"'To endow Popery once more in a land that has been rescued from its yoke, is a madness little short of high treason against heaven.'\*

"Protestant fellow-subjects,—We are soon to be called upon to make a further grant of public money for the support of the religion of the Church of Rome.

"Her Majesty's Government, on the first day of the present session of Parliament, spoke in very plain and intelligible language to this effect, through the Prime Minister. The College of Maynooth, at which students are trained for the Romish priesthood, is to receive 'a liberal' increase of support from the public

---

\* See the "Concluding Reflections" in a valuable and important work by the Rev. T. R. Birks, published in 1844, by Seeley, Burnside, and Seeley.

purse, and there is to be no investigation of the doctrines inculcated at the College, or of its discipline and management, lest the grace of the boon should thereby be lessened.

"No doubt Her Majesty's Ministers intend by this, and other proposals with regard to Ireland, to conciliate the Roman Catholic population there, to put an end to the cry for the Repeal of the Union, and to remove from the Romish priesthood and from political agitators, certain grounds of complaint and alleged injustice. But how little do they appear to have profited from past experience, if they are seriously entertaining the expectation, that the steps they now propose to take, will make the Roman Catholic population of Ireland a peaceful and contented population! How numerous and solemn were the promises and assurances given before the passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Act in 1829, that all would be peaceable and tranquil, if Roman Catholics were admitted into Parliament,—that this would be the sure method of rendering the Established Religion in Ireland secure, and producing general content and satisfaction!

"The step was taken, and other privileges have since been granted; and now the Established Church is the 'monster evil' of Ireland, which must be removed; and it is too plain that no arrangements will be satisfactory which do not leave the Church of Rome supreme and dominant. The power and influence, which by various provisions have been conferred on the Roman Catholics, instead of making them tranquil and grateful subjects of the United Empire, have been, and still are, employed for the advancement of their further objects;—and, being emboldened by what they have already obtained, they tell you plainly, they will not be satisfied, if this and that object of their desires be withheld from them.

"Brother Protestants,—Are you acquainted with the character of the books which are used at the College of Maynooth? We know the titles of these books, and who were the authors of them; for a Parliamentary document declares them to us; and the books themselves may be referred to, for copies of them are deposited in the public libraries of Oxford and Cambridge. But, whatever the character of them may be, it seems no inquiry is thought desirable,—no investigation of any kind is to be made of them!

"I am acquainted with the contents of some of these books; and I declare to you, that many of the doctrines inculcated from them into the minds of the students for the Roman Catholic priesthood, whom you are liberally to support, are such as all honest and sincere Christians would shudder at. I affirm to you, that, under the direction of such doctrines, if circumstances might allow a practical appeal to them, our Protestant monarch would not be safe upon her throne; the liberty, the property, the lives of our Protestant fellow-countrymen would not be secure.

"And you are to contribute to the training up of priests, who are to be taught out of these books, and who will disseminate what they learn through the length and breadth of the sister island! Nay, more, you are to contribute to the training up of men, who, as priests of the Church of Rome, will have to teach and preach doctrines which you verily believe to be highly dishonourable to your Divine Redeemer, the King of kings and Lord of lords, and to be destructive to the souls of men! Such of you as are members of the Established Church are to aid the training of men who are to propagate tenets, which, according to the Articles of your Religion, you declare to be 'blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits,' errors 'vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God.'

"I ask you, will you yield to this, without the energetic and uncompromising use

of all legitimate and constitutional means to avert the disgrace, the danger, the sin, that are threatening to befall your Country? Will you not pour your Petitions into Parliament from every city and borough, from every village and hamlet, from every congregation loving Protestant truth? Will not such of you as take any part in the Election of Members of Parliament, assure your particular Representatives, that they represent not your feelings and desires if they shall yield to the proposal of the Government, and thus forward measures which, in your consciences, you believe to be politically unwise, because inoperative to effect the end desired,—and nationally sinful, provoking the displeasure of the Most High, and calling down upon your Country His righteous judgment?

“As you value His favour, as you deprecate His frown, as your hearths and your altars are dear to you; as you would retain and enjoy for yourselves, and transmit to your children, the blessings and privileges which belong to you as Protestants, I beseech you to oppose, with all zeal and firmness, with all temperance and calmness, with all loyal attachment to your Sovereign—with all union among yourselves—with all charity towards all men—with all prayer and supplication towards God—this fresh inroad about to be made upon your consciences,—this new and deep wound to your highest and holiest feelings.

“And I call upon you the more anxiously to do this, because the measure proposed seems to be not only wrong in itself, but to be one which, if unopposed, will probably lead to greater evils.

“What if your efforts may not be successful? Still, in making your solemn protest against the intended evil, and using your earnest endeavours to avert it, you will have done your duty; and it will but remain for you to commit your cause to Him who is over all, and to cast the fearful responsibility of the proposed measure on the quarter to which it belongs.

“Believe me to be, your faithful friend and servant,

“JOHN P. PLUMPTRE.

“*London, March 10, 1845.*”

It is due to Mr. Plumptre to preserve this Address; and to him every British Protestant is deeply indebted for the exertions which he made, both in the House and out of the House, in opposition to this unprotestant and unprincipled measure.

But before this Address was issued—before any Meeting had been held in London, or any influence from the Metropolis could have reached the Country—while, indeed, for a short space, it might rather have been said, that there was an unaccountable delay and tardiness in London—the first tidings of the Government proposal were sufficient to stir up decided opposition in different parts of the Country. For example, a Meeting was held at Nottingham, in the Assembly Rooms, on Tuesday, February 11th, (only one week after the announcement made by Sir Robert Peel in the House of Commons,) which was very crowded and most respectable, and attended by a large number of the local Clergy. A most decided “protest” was made against the support of Popery; and one of the speakers stated, that the whole body of the Wesleyans throughout England were preparing, as one man, to resist the measures

proposed. A Petition emanated from this Meeting, to which, on the 7th of March, *nine thousand* signatures had been affixed.\*

It has been said that the Petitions from the Country were only the echoes of the sentiments of a Committee in London. There is, however, reason to believe that, in many places, Protestants in the Country were rather surprised at the tardiness of London to move in the matter. Many would naturally be glad of information and suggestions from London, with regard to the time and form of petitioning, and anxiously waited for it. But the Protestant feeling of the Country was already at work before any public steps had been taken in the Metropolis.

On February 28th, the following names were added to the standing Committee :—

Resolved, "That the following names be added to the standing Committee:—Dr. Archer, Henry Blanchard, Esq., Rev. Dr. Bunting, Rev. H. H. Beamish, Rev. A. Burder, †Rev. R. Burgess, G. Rochfort Clarke, Esq., Rev. Dr. Cumming, Rev. G. Clayton, Alderman Challis, Rev. R. W. Dibdin, T. Farmer, Esq., Rev. J. Freeman, Alexander Gordon, Esq., W. W. Hull, Esq., †Rev. J. Harding, Rev. Dr. Holloway, Alderman Hunter, Rev. Dr. Leifchild, Sir Peter Laurie, Rev. J. C. Miller, Rev. Dr. Morison, Rev. Dr. Stewart, Hon. Col. Wingfield Stratford, B. Smith, Esq., Rev. John Stamp, Mr. Spicer, E. V. Sidebottom, Esq., Rev. James Sherman, Rev. A. Tidman, — Woodroffe, Esq., Rev. A. Wells, †Rev. Daniel Wilson, D. W. Wire, Esq."

At the very outset of these proceedings in London, a letter from Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart., which was communicated to the Committee of the Protestant Association by the Rev. E. Bickersteth, greatly encouraged the friends of Protestantism, to attempt a combined and united movement of all British Protestants, in opposition to the measure proposed by the Government. It was not, however, till March 11th, that Sir C. E. Smith actually joined the Standing Committee, and gave his personal exertions to the cause, in which he afterwards laboured so strenuously. From that time the Anti-Maynooth Committee became more active and

---

\* A Correspondent of "The Record" wrote thus on the subject of this Petition. (See "Record" of March 10th.)

"The feeling here on the subject is most decided. Men of all political parties are coming forward to oppose the obnoxious measure; nay, there is scarcely any Protestant,—Whig, Tory, or Radical,—who is averse to the Petition. This feeling is owing to a conviction of the idolatrous and anti-social character of Popery which pervades the minds of the people; and this conviction has been brought about, under God, BY THE PERSEVERING EXERTIONS OF A CLERGYMAN, WHO, FOR NEARLY TWO YEARS, HAS BEEN DELIVERING WEEKLY LECTURES ON POPERY TO LARGE AND INCREASING AUDIENCES."

If the good example of this Clergyman were followed by *Ministers of the Gospel generally, for the next two years*, what might we not expect, under the blessing of God?—EDITOR.

† These Clergymen, though named in the Resolution, never acted upon the Committee.

energetic. On that day it was resolved that the following letter should be sent to all the Clergy and other Ministers of Religion in the metropolis; it was also forwarded to the Editors of the Patriot, Record, Church and State Gazette, and Watchman, with a request that they would kindly notice it in those papers.

“Reverend Sir,—You are earnestly requested by the Committee for opposing the increased Grant to Maynooth, to give notice of the proposed Meeting to your Congregation on Sunday next, and to call upon them, as they reverence the Word of God,—as they dread the principles of Popery,—and as they value their Christian and Protestant privileges, and the true welfare of their Country, to come forward at this national crisis,—to attend the Meeting,—to make it generally known among their friends, and in every way to give their best support to the object which it has in view.

“On behalf of the Committee,

(Signed)

“GEORGE FINCH.

“CULLING EARDLEY SMITH.

“CHARLES PREST.

“*Exeter Hall, March 11th, 1845.*

“P.S.—The favour of your attendance is also requested in the Standing Committee, which meets here each Tuesday and Friday, at two o’clock.”

The previous arrangements having been completed, the first Public Meeting in London was held at Exeter Hall, on Tuesday, March 18th. The Great Room, on this occasion, was not so crowded as it was at subsequent Meetings; but the Platform was well filled, and a very much larger proportion of gentlemen was observed in the body of the Hall than is usually to be found, even on the most interesting and important occasions. It was evident, that those who were more especially called upon *to act*, were already beginning to bestir themselves in strenuous opposition to the measure proposed.

The Chair was taken by J. P. Plumptre, Esq., M.P. for East Kent. The Rev. Dr. Holloway opened the Meeting with a solemn and affecting prayer; after which, the Rev. John Blackburn read the forty-sixth Psalm,—that which Martin Luther, in times of difficulty and danger, was so much accustomed to sing, that it became known by the name of Luther’s Psalm. Mr. Plumptre then addressed the Meeting, and pointed out the peculiar circumstances under which it was assembled—the importance of the crisis—and the duty and necessity of vigorous exertion; and particularly expressed his satisfaction at the union of Protestants of all Denominations in this great movement.

The Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel moved the following Resolution, which was seconded by the Rev. C. Prest, Secretary to the Wesleyan Committee of Privileges:—

“That this Meeting, recognising the holy Scriptures as the only unerring rule and standard both of faith and practice, and convinced by the testimony of that

Word, that the doctrines of the Church of Rome, as defined by the Council of Trent, embodied in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and exemplified in its general practice and teaching, are 'superstitious and idolatrous,' and opposed to the best interests of Society, and to the welfare of immortal souls, must regard all support and countenance given to such a system by the State, as calculated to bring down the judgments of God upon this Protestant Country."

Mr. Noel, in moving this Resolution, entered at large into the consideration of the special object of the Meeting. He pointed out, very clearly, the distinction between the concession of Civil Rights and Privileges to Roman Catholics, and the Legislative Sanction and Endowment of their Religion; gave a lucid view of the History of Maynooth College; proved, by many testimonies, the total failure of the Institution to secure those objects, in the contemplation of which it was first established; showed that the present measure was only the commencement of a system of Legislation which would inevitably terminate in the Endowment of the Romish Church in Ireland; illustrated the doctrines of the Church of Rome, which were taught, and would be taught at Maynooth; refuted the principal arguments, by which the present measure was supported; and, finally, pointed out the duties of Protestants, and the importance of Protestant combination and union, in order to any effectual opposition to the measure proposed. The Rev. Gentleman took occasion to disclaim, in the most decided manner, all personal enmity to Roman Catholics—all desire to injure them—all disposition to oppose any measures which could tend to their real welfare,—which, on the contrary, he and all true Protestants would ever be most ready to promote. And to these expressions of good-will and kind feeling towards the persons of Roman Catholics, the whole Meeting most cordially responded; while, at the same time, it manifested the most decided opposition to the doctrines of Popery, and to every measure which tended to sanction and propagate the superstitious and idolatrous delusions of that Church.\*

The second Resolution was moved by the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, and seconded by James Cook Evans, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

"That the support so long given by an annual Parliamentary Grant to the College of Maynooth, in which those doctrines are taught, has been viewed with the greatest repugnance, not only by your petitioners, but by the large majority of British Protestants of all Denominations; and that your petitioners are convinced that the said Grant has been maintained, during past years, notwithstanding this repugnance, mainly from an impression on the minds of many persons, that the national faith was pledged to its continuance;—that this meeting, however, is unable to discover any evidence of such alleged compact or agreement, and fully believes the said impression to be entirely erroneous, and that no such engagement was ever entered into."

---

\* The substance of this Speech, with much additional matter, illustrative of the Doctrines and Practices of Popery, was afterwards published by the Hon. and Rev. Gentleman, under the title of "The Proposed Increase of the Grant to Maynooth."



The Rev. Mr. Bickersteth, in proposing this Resolution, insisted distinctly on the Protestant ground of opposition to the Bill, as being a direct support of an idolatrous and superstitious Religion, that Maynooth was a nursery of Idolatry, the sin especially denounced by God; and entered more particularly into the scriptural grounds upon which our repugnance to the measure rested.

Mr. Evans brought his professional knowledge and habits of research to bear upon the question, and very ably and unanswerably disposed of the notion of a *compact*; a notion which, beyond all question, had led many to acquiesce in an Annual Grant, which otherwise they would have stedfastly opposed. He pointed out the fact, which he had ascertained from the Records of the Proceedings of the Irish House of Commons, that, when the original Act for legalising the Establishment of a Popish College in Ireland was introduced, it contained not a syllable with respect to any Grant of the public money; but, just in the last stage of the proceedings, a clause was introduced, by which His Majesty was "authorised to advance £8000 towards *establishing* the said Academy:" and that, in February, 1799, a Petition from the Trustees being presented to the (Irish) House of Commons, a series of Resolutions was passed by that House, *which might have been considered as pledging the Legislature to the permanent support of the College*. The Bill was sent up to the Lords on the 5th of April; but, on tracing its progress, it appeared that the consideration of it was adjourned to a day on which the House did not meet; *it was, in fact, thrown out by a majority of twenty-five to one*. Nor did the Act of Union pledge the Country to support the College. The opponents of the present measure were, therefore, fully justified in denying the existence of a compact.

The third Resolution was moved by Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart., and seconded by the Rev. George Cubitt:—

"That believing the proposal made by Her Majesty's Government for increased public support to the College of Maynooth to involve the whole question of a National Endowment of Popery, and regarding it as an important step towards the full Establishment of the Romish Church in Ireland, this Meeting would call upon all true Protestants of every Denomination throughout the Empire, to unite in opposing a measure fraught with such pernicious consequences; and by Petitions to Parliament, and all other Constitutional measures, to make known their utter repugnance to the national recognition and maintenance of the Romish faith."

The fourth Resolution was moved by the Rev. W. Chalmers, of the Free Church of Scotland, and seconded by the Rev. W. Curling, Chaplain of St. Saviour's, Southwark:—

"That the following Petition, founded on the preceding Resolutions, be adopted, and that the same lie for signature at Messrs. Seeleys, Baisler, Nisbets, Dalton,

Hatchard, Rivingtons, Snow, Mason, Houlston and Stoneman, Ward, Jackson and Walford, Haselden, Jackson, Cotes, Couty, and at 11, Exeter Hall.

"To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

"The Petition of the undersigned,

"Humbly sheweth—

"That your petitioners, recognising the holy Scriptures as the only unerring rule and standard both of faith and practice, and convinced by the testimony of that Word that the doctrines of the Church of Rome, as defined by the Council of Trent, embodied in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., and exemplified in its general practice and teaching, are 'superstitious and idolatrous,' and opposed to the best interests of society, and to the welfare of immortal souls, must regard all support and countenance given to such a system by the State, as calculated to bring down the judgments of God upon this Protestant country.

"That the support so long given by an annual Parliamentary Grant to the College of Maynooth, in which those doctrines are taught, has been viewed with the greatest repugnance, not only by your petitioners, but by the large majority of British Protestants of all Denominations; and that your petitioners are convinced that the said Grant has been 'maintained, during past years, notwithstanding this repugnance, mainly from an impression on the minds of many persons, that the national faith was pledged to its continuance;—that your petitioners, however, are unable to discover any evidence of such alleged compact or agreement, and fully believe the said impression to be entirely erroneous, and that no such engagement was ever entered into.

"That believing the proposal made by Her Majesty's Government for increased public support to the College of Maynooth to involve the whole question of a National Endowment of Popery, and regarding it as an important step towards the full establishment of the Romish Church in Ireland, your petitioners implore your Honourable House not to accede to any measure fraught with such pernicious consequences.

"And your petitioners, &c."

"And that the following Gentlemen do form a Committee, to carry out the objects of the Meeting."

The list of names need not be here inserted: it will be found, as afterwards corrected and enlarged, in a subsequent page, as the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee.\*

George Finch, Esq. then moved a vote of thanks to the Chairman, which was seconded by the Rev. Edward Pizey; and, after singing the Doxology, the Meeting separated at Five o'clock.

By this Meeting that Committee was appointed, which afterwards

---

\* At this period of the meeting, Sir Culling E. Smith came forward, and said that he had ascertained, that two persons who had disturbed the proceedings of the Meeting early in the day, were Roman Catholic Priests, the Rev. John Telford, and the Rev. Peter Way. Two gentlemen, friends of his, sat near them, and followed them out. They signed the Petition,—but one of them in the following terms, "For an increased Grant to Maynooth," and the other, "For a Grant of £30,000 to Maynooth."

laboured so earnestly, under the title of THE CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE, in opposition to the Bill for the Endowment of that College. Its first Meeting was held on March 20th, when the following Resolution was adopted, *as the basis of union among Protestants of various Denominations in all their future proceedings.*

“That, while this Committee is well aware that the particular grounds on which different bodies will found their Petitions against the proposed Grant to Maynooth, may occasionally exhibit, to a certain degree, the diversities of sentiment that prevail among them; they are nevertheless convinced that, in a cordial attachment to the principles of the Protestant Reformation, and a stedfast abhorrence of Popery, there is a solid ground for union and co-operation in opposing the proposed measure; and they deem it of supreme importance, under present circumstances, to bear with one another in regard to minor differences, while they cordially unite in one great object.”

At this Meeting of the Committee it was, that the friends of the Protestant cause were first made aware of the real nature of the Measure proposed by the Government. It appeared that, on the preceding evening, in the House of Commons, Sir Robert Inglis had asked Sir Robert Peel, “In what mode he proposed to deal with the subject of Maynooth,—Whether by increased Grant in the estimates of the current year, or by Bill?—which latter mode of proceeding would evidently place the College on a permanent basis, and withdraw it from the annual revision of Parliament.” To this Sir Robert Peel replied, “*that he certainly proposed to proceed by Bill.* . . . . for he thought there would be great advantage in removing the subject from annual discussion. . . . . and *that no advantage would arise from reviving annually the religious discussion.*” Upon receiving this intelligence, the Committee, immediately, took measures to ensure, as far as possible, the union and co-operation of all the various bodies of Protestants. They summoned a Meeting of the Committee, at which Representatives of all the various bodies in the Metropolis were invited to attend: they also published forthwith the following advertisement:—

#### “ENDOWMENT OF POPERY.

“*Central Anti-Maynooth Committee,*

“11, *Exeter Hall, London, March 20th, 1845.*

“It having been announced in Parliament, that the Government intend to propose a large and permanent increase to the Grant annually made to Maynooth College, which, if accomplished, will give a legislative sanction to Roman Catholic doctrine as there taught, and probably lead to the public maintenance of the whole Romish Priesthood in Ireland, the Committee appointed at a Meeting in the Large Room, Exeter Hall, on the 18th instant, J. P. Plumptre, Esq. M.P., in the Chair, to combine and guide the opposition of all true Protestants throughout the Kingdom against the enlargement of this Grant, beg to urge their fellow-Christians immedi-

ately to express their opinions on this subject, by calling Public Meetings, by procuring signatures to Petitions against the Grant, and by using all their influence with their Representatives to avert this impending evil. The Committee do this with the more assurance, as they pledge themselves to offer their utmost resistance to the proposed measure, and are prepared to give every facility in their power to the Protestant community in their opposition to it, by supplying information, forms of Petition, &c.

“ By Direction of the Committee,

“ JAMES LORD, *Secretary.*”

The Central Anti-Maynooth Committee was now formed, consisting of the Gentlemen appointed at the recent Meeting, and the Representatives of various bodies of Protestants in the Metropolis, who had been requested to join it, in order to give it greater advantages for communicating with those whom they represented, and those with whom they were connected in various parts of the Country. Sir Culling Eardley Smith was appointed Chairman of the Committee, and James Lord, Secretary; and every member of the Committee, who had the pleasure of labouring with them, can bear testimony to the indefatigable zeal and diligence with which they devoted themselves to the cause in which they were engaged. An Executive Committee was also appointed, consisting of the following gentlemen:—

“ Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart., Chairman, James Lord, Esq., Secretary, Rev. J. Blackburn,—Jabez Burns,—Dr. Bennett,—W. M. Bunting,—T. Tenison Cuff,—J. Cumming, D.D.,—W. Chalmers, T. Farmer, Esq., T. Hamilton, Esq., Rev. J. T. Holloway, D.D.,—S. R. Hall, W. W. Hull, Esq., Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel, J. D. Paul, Esq., Rev. C. Prest,—H. Robbins,—A. Reed, D.D., R. B. Seeley, Esq., and Rev. A. S. Thelwall.”

For greater convenience of communication with various parties, the Committee Room was removed to the London Coffee House, Ludgate Street. A very extensive correspondence was opened with various parts of the Country; and, from time to time, suitable circulars were issued; handbills were distributed, and large posting-bills were placarded in various parts of the Metropolis, or carried about through the streets, in order to awaken attention, or communicate information, as circumstances transpired. And, as the nature of the proposed Measure now became apparent, and knowledge upon that head was diffused through the Country, numerous and important meetings were held, from day to day in various places, and Petitions began to pour in to the House of Commons.

On Thursday, March 20th, Sir Robert Peel gave notice in the House of Commons, that he should introduce his Bill for an increased Grant to Maynooth on that day fortnight. In reference to this announcement, the Executive Committee, among other measures, issued the following circular, to Protestants in all parts of the Kingdom.

“CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

*London Coffee-House, Ludgate Street, London,  
March 28th, 1845.*

DEAR SIR,

It has been announced that, on the 3rd of April next, a Bill will be introduced into Parliament, which will pledge this Protestant Country to the permanent support of a College for the education of the Romish priesthood in Ireland.

We trust that you feel that this measure ought to be strenuously opposed; and we would remind you, that there is not one moment to be lost.

A Committee, composed of Protestants of various Denominations, has been appointed by the Public Meeting held at Exeter Hall on Tuesday, the 18th, to carry out its objects, and to concentrate the efforts of Protestants in opposition to the proposed measure. It has appointed an Executive Committee, which sits here daily, for the purpose of affording every assistance and information in their power to all who are disposed to concur in their great object.

The following practical suggestions are offered :—

1. The importance of getting up Parochial and Congregational Petitions, addressed to both Houses of Parliament, but more especially to the House of Commons. These should be properly signed; that is to say, they should only be signed by males, above sixteen years of age.

2. These Petitions should be put into the hands of your own Members, and of Noblemen in your own neighbourhood, with an earnest entreaty that they will support the prayer of the Petition. If you have any difficulty on this point, you are requested to forward your Petitions to the care of this Committee, who will see that the same are duly presented.

3. That Public Meetings should be held, for the purpose of stirring up Protestant feeling and principle in opposition to the measure, if local circumstances admit; and, wherever there is a Town Council likely to co-operate, it should be especially convened, and urged to petition in its corporate capacity. This Committee will be happy to give every assistance in their power, by means of Deputations to attend Public Meetings.

4. It is of immense importance, that Protestant electors should use their personal influence, in the way of direct appeal to their own Representatives, whether *Liberal* or *Conservative*. Any considerable number of electors combining to assure their Representatives, that, if they vote for the Grant to Maynooth, it is highly probable that it will materially prejudice them at the next Election, will ensure such serious consideration as no Petitions to Parliament would be likely to command.

We are well aware of the dangerous proximity of the subject of endowing Maynooth College to questions upon which Protestants are not agreed. There is a conscientious diversity of sentiment as to the propriety of the Civil Government giving any support to Religion; and it may reasonably be expected, that this diversity of opinion will, to a certain degree, modify the grounds on which different Petitions are founded. But we are persuaded, that a cordial attachment to the great Principles of the Protestant Reformation, and a steadfast abhorrence of Popery, as a system opposed to Christ and his Gospel, will furnish a broad and sufficient ground of co-operation among all Protestants in opposition to the measure proposed. We trust

that Protestants, agreeing in the great and saving truths of the Word of God, have learned, and will learn, enough of the spirit of their Divine Redeemer and Lord, to differ, when they do differ, in the spirit of love. They acknowledge, and they feel, that there is one body and one Spirit, even as they are called in one hope of their calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all; and it is their privilege and their joy, no less than their Scriptural duty, especially at such a crisis as this, to make it evident that they are 'endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.' And, if this be their endeavour, they will be prepared to bear and forbear with one another in the spirit of love and meekness.

If ever there was a time in which it was important for Christians and Protestants to act together in this spirit, with united energies, it is the present.

We are unquestionably entering on the field of a mighty conflict. Popery, under the guidance of the Jesuits, is making a convulsive and desperate effort in every quarter of the world. It is notoriously agitating the Governments of Spain, France, and Switzerland; and it is more secretly disquieting other nations. It is persecuting the Gospel in Madeira, and has stirred up a gallant and generous nation to overthrow a Protestant throne at Tahiti. It is threatening starvation and death to our brethren in the West of Ireland. It is fulminating from the Vatican its edicts against the Bible, defying the efforts of transatlantic Christians to introduce the Word of God into Italy, and warning Italian princes of the danger of their thrones if they admit the Scriptures into their dominions; and now also, it is besieging the Protestant bulwarks of the British Crown and Constitution.

Rome is bold! But we know that she is doomed, and we believe that she is soon to fall. Let us be faithful to our God, and to our Country. Let us *be instant in prayer*, abounding in brotherly love, and united in the sight of God and man; and thus, perhaps, the very season of our most serious apprehensions may, by the overruling and merciful providence of our Saviour, be converted into an occasion of grateful triumph.

The importance of the occasion must be our apology for the freedom of this communication. And if there should be any who are not prepared to unite with us in our proceedings, and yet are willing to labour in opposition to the proposed measure, we cordially wish them God speed. We are far from dictating to any one, while we are ready to give to every one every assistance in our power. If any think they can work more satisfactorily, or more effectually, on entirely independent ground, let them do so by all means. Only let them be prompt, and energetic in the course of action which is most congenial to their own views and feelings.

Signed, on behalf of the Committee,

CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman*.  
JAMES LORD, *Secretary*.

The following form of Petition is suggested:—

"To the Honourable the Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

"The Petition of the undersigned,

"Humbly sheweth—

"That your petitioners, believing the proposal made by Her Majesty's Government for increased public support to the College of Maynooth, to involve the whole question of a national Endowment of Popery, and regarding it as a fearful step

towards the full establishment of the Romish Church in Ireland, earnestly implore your Honourable House not to accede to any measure fraught with such pernicious consequences.

“ And your Petitioners, &c.”

N.B. In Petitions to the House of Lords, the words ‘To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal,’ &c., must be substituted for ‘The Honourable the Commons,’ and the words ‘Right Honourable House,’ for ‘Honourable House.’

Petitions, not exceeding the weight of thirty-two ounces, and open at both ends, may be forwarded by post, to any Member of Parliament, *free*; and they may be prepared either on parchment or writing paper. If a letter is sent at the same time, it should be posted separately.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE WILL SIT DAILY FROM NINE IN THE MORNING TILL FIVE IN THE AFTERNOON, TO EXPEDITE BUSINESS, AND WILL BE HAPPY TO RECEIVE ANY COMMUNICATION, AND TO GIVE EVERY INFORMATION TO PARTIES DESIRING IT.

An Historical Tract on the Subject is now ready.”

The Tract here alluded to was entitled “Historical Statement concerning Maynooth College.” It contained a brief statement of Facts, and was widely circulated by the Committee. The Tracts and Pamphlets which were published about this time, from different quarters, were far too numerous to be mentioned. One of the most lucid, and (as it might have been fairly supposed) best calculated to open the eyes of worldly Politicians to the true nature of the instruction given to the Students at Maynooth—the Relation of the Romish Hierarchy and Ecclesiastics to the Pope—and the Danger of Sanctioning and Encouraging the System of Popery in a Protestant State, was a Pamphlet entitled—“Maynooth, the Crown, and the Country.” The postscript to the *Second Edition* was dated April 4th. It was understood at the time to proceed from the pen of Dr. C. Wordsworth, who afterwards openly acknowledged it.

On Thursday, April 3rd, as had been previously announced, Sir Robert Peel brought forward his measure. The SPEAKER having suggested, that it might be convenient for those Hon. Members, who had Petitions relating to the question of the Grant to Maynooth, now to present them, a vast number of Members, especially on the Ministerial side of the House, instantly started up, rustling with parchments, which appeared to excite a considerable sensation in the House. The manifestation of opposition was indeed so decided, that Sir Robert Peel, having moved that the whole House should resolve itself into Committee for the purpose of considering the Acts relating to the College of Maynooth, commenced his speech with very marked allusions to the character and extent of that opposition. At the same time, the Right Honourable Baronet took great credit to himself, for having given, at the close of

the last Session, some intimation,—indicating that the probable result of the consideration which Ministers were pledged to give, would be an improvement in the system of Maynooth, accompanied with an increase of the public Grant.

[This intimation certainly had been given : and it had alarmed the zealous and watchful friends of the Protestant cause : but no one expected anything like the present measure.]

He then stated the grounds upon which he proceeded, to the following effect :—

“We took the state of that College into our consideration; we considered the extent of any obligations, in point of honour and good faith, which past transactions and past acts of the Legislature might, in our opinion, impose upon the Executive Government and Parliament of the Country in reference to this subject; we considered the practical effect of the present system pursued at Maynooth, the probable effect of any alteration which might be made in that system; and, having given to the whole subject the best consideration in our power, I now, on the part of the executive Government of this Country, submit to the deliberate consideration of the House of Commons the proposal which, on the part of the Government, we are prepared to make. Sir, it has appeared to us that we are at liberty to pursue one or other of three courses with respect to the Institution of Maynooth. It is competent for us to continue without alteration the present system, and the present amount of the Parliamentary Grant. It is competent to us to discontinue the vote altogether,—to repudiate all connexion with Maynooth, and, after providing perhaps for the protection of existing interests, publicly to notify, that there shall hereafter be no connexion between Government and the College of Maynooth. That is the second course which it appeared to us possible to pursue. The third course is, to adopt, in a friendly and liberal spirit, the Institution provided for the education of the Roman Catholic priesthood, to extend the Parliamentary provision for that purpose, and to attempt, not by interference with the doctrine or discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, but by a more liberal provision, to improve the system of education, and to elevate the tone and character of that Institution. Any one of these three courses is open to us. Sir, with respect to the first,—the continuance, without alteration or modification of any kind, of the present Grant and the present system,—I declare, on the part of Her Majesty’s Government, that it is our deliberate conviction, that of all courses that can be pursued, that would be the most pregnant with mischief. We profess to make provision for a national system—we profess to make provision for the education of those who are to give spiritual instruction and religious consolation to many millions of the people of Ireland. We just give enough, by voting annually £9000 a-year, to discourage and paralyse voluntary contributions for that purpose.”

After discussing, at some length, the state of Maynooth under the Annual Grant, and drawing a sad picture of the unsatisfactory results of that system, in regard to the present condition of the College and the Students, the Right Honourable Baronet went on :—

“I say any course is preferable to this. I come then to the consideration of another alternative. Shall we avow that our conscientious scruples are so violated in the maintenance of this system, that we will discontinue the connexion with



Maynooth; that the vote shall, after some temporary arrangements, be discontinued, and the burden of educating the priesthood shall be thrown upon the people of Ireland? ('Hear, hear,' from one of the back Ministerial benches.) I infer that there are some who think that a desirable course. ('Hear, hear,' from the same quarter.) Before you adopt this course, (loud cheers, especially from the Opposition benches,) I ask the House to listen to the statement I am about to make, of the reasons which prevent me from counselling it."

Sir Robert Peel then pointed out what had been done by preceding Ministers and Parliaments, and then said :—

"Shall we now, in opposition to the acts of our predecessors, say to them, 'That favour, which was granted to you under the Administration of Mr. Pitt, must now be withheld from you on account of a conscientious scruple?' Sir, I should deprecate the effect of such a step. It is not the amount of the pecuniary Grant; what I deprecate is, the *animus* it would indicate. We should never be able to convince those from whom the Grant was withheld, that those scruples, which were not felt by George III., by Mr. Pitt, by the exclusively Protestant Legislature of their own Country, are now felt to such a degree by us, that we must abandon the connexion which was thus formed."

This seems to have been the grand argument. In an evil hour, and certainly *under very peculiar circumstances*, Mr. Pitt had tried the experiment of sacrificing Protestant principle to expediency. It may be most confidently affirmed, that a wretched experiment it has proved—*a total failure*. The only wisdom would be, to confess this at once, and to say, With the help of God we will try these wicked and wretched experiments no more. But what Statesman has courage to do this? —to confess a national sin, and to renounce it? Alas! the only way that a wise worldly politician can think of pursuing is, to go on doing worse and worse! This is Sir Robert Peel's *political wisdom*! And so he concludes :—

"Well, can I then, after reviewing our former course as to the Colonies, and as to the Roman Catholics of Ireland,—seeing what has passed for the last fifty years,—come to the conclusion to which some are prepared to come, that we are to refuse this Grant, upon the ground that it would be a violation of principle to agree to it? Well, then, I have disposed of two of the courses which it is competent for us to pursue,—the entire repudiation of any Grant to Maynooth, or the continuation of the present one. There remains but one other course, and that is the course which we are prepared to take. Prepared! Yes, I will avow it, that we are prepared, in a liberal sense and a confiding spirit, to improve that Institution, and to elevate the tone of education there."

Such were the views which Sir Robert Peel enunciated in bringing forward his measure. Of these it was desirable to give a brief statement. The idea of any *actual compact*, he evidently discards. All he can plead is, *the custom of fifty years*, and the appearance of a claim which grows out of it: at the same time confessing, that the mere

continuance of the usual Annual Grant would be the worst course that could possibly be pursued !

With regard to the intimation given, and the expectations or apprehensions thence arising, Sir Robert H. Inglis, Bart., Member for the University of Oxford, very properly replied :—

“ Taking the feeling of the Country, as manifested by the number of Petitions, to be opposed to his Right Hon. Friend's proposition, before the details were explained, he (Sir R. Inglis) thought he knew enough of his fellow-countrymen to be able to say, that the statement of his Right Honourable Friend, made that night, would excite a still deeper and more general feeling of opposition. His Right Honourable Friend stated, that he had not taken the House by surprise; as he had undertaken, at the close of the last Session, to take the great question of Academical Education in Ireland into consideration: but *could any one, from what then took place, have anticipated such a measure as that now proposed?* He would not, however, deny, that it might possibly have entered into the hearts and imaginations of *some of the Hon. Gentlemen opposite*, on whose support the Government now mainly depended, that the Government would introduce a measure like the present.”

It is not necessary, or desirable, to go at length into the discussion which took place on that, or on other occasions; but it should be observed, that while Sir Robert Peel carefully abstained from any allusion to *ulterior measures*, (with regard to the Endowment of the Romish Priesthood,)—*that* question was distinctly referred to by Honourable Members on both sides of the House. First, Lord Sandon, a Conservative,—after giving up the idea of any actual or definite compact,—said :—

“ He did not want to be urged by the mere term ‘compact’ to do an act of justice. He had, on every occasion, voted in favour of Catholic Emancipation; and he had also voted with his Noble Friend, the Member for South Lancashire, in favour of an Endowment for the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland; and he would vote for that proposal again, if it were brought before the House. However much he might respect the motives of those who opposed such a measure, he could not agree in their opinions, or partake in their views on that question.”

Lord John Russell, the leader of the Whigs, afterwards spoke very decidedly on the subject. He said :—

“ I am not going to argue, whether, even with respect to this particular question, the House should or should not adopt the motion of which my Honourable Friend near me (Mr. Ward) has given a notice; but this I say, that arguments which are so sound, and, as I think, so incontrovertible, to induce this House to found an Endowment for the Education of the Roman Catholic Priesthood, will prove, upon another occasion, as sound and as incontrovertible with respect to an Endowment for the Maintenance of that Priesthood. For my own part,—preferring most strongly, and more and more by reflection, Religious Establishments to that which is called the Voluntary principle,—I am anxious to see the spiritual, the religious instructors

of the great majority of the people of Ireland, endowed and maintained by a provision furnished by the State. I do not hesitate to give that opinion. I am not committing any person on the part of the Government; I am speaking independently for myself: but I will not give this vote, misleading any one by the notion, that, if there came a question (proposed in a manner in which I should think that it could practically and properly be carried into effect) for the payment of the Roman Catholic Priesthood, I should not think the reasons upon which I shall vote to-night equally conclusive to induce me to concur in that proposal. The Noble Lord, the Member for South Lancashire, (Lord F. Egerton,) referred to a Motion which he made twenty years ago for that purpose. I had the honour of voting with him upon that occasion."

These observations were made in the presence of the Prime Minister, *without eliciting any disclaimer from him*. The Anti-Maynooth Committee, therefore, felt themselves to be fully warranted in appealing to the Country, not merely with regard to *the Endowment of Maynooth*, but with regard to *ulterior measures*—to which that Endowment was only a preparatory step; they felt themselves authorised to propose the question, plainly and unequivocally,—“PROTESTANTS OF ENGLAND, *are you prepared to pay for a POPISH ESTABLISHMENT?*” for nothing less than this appeared to be the real question at issue.

After a long debate, the House divided. The following list of the Division is taken from the usual Parliamentary Document, which is published on such occasions. Those Members who usually vote *against* the present Government are distinguished by an asterisk.

*Jovis, 3<sup>o</sup> die Aprilis, 1845.*

Numb. 35. Maynooth College,—(In the Committee:)—Motion made, and Question put,—‘That the Chairman be directed to move the House, that leave be given to bring in a Bill to amend the Acts relating to the College of Maynooth;’—The Committee *divided*; Ayes 216, Noes 114.

#### AYES.

Acland, Sir Thomas Dyke (Devonsh.)	Bentinck, Lord George
Acland, Thomas Dyke (Somersetsh.)	Blandford, Marquis of
Adare, Viscount	Boldero, Henry George
Adderley, Charles Bowyer	Borthwick, Peter
*Ainsworth, Peter	Botfield, Beriah
*Aldam, William	*Bowes, John
Alford, Viscount	Bowles, Admiral
*Arundel and Surrey, Earl of	*Bowring, Dr.
Baillie, Colonel (Honiton)	Bramston, Thomas William
Baird, William	*Brotherton, Joseph
*Baring, Rt. Hon. F. T. (Portsmouth)	*Browne, Hon. W. (Kerry Co.)
Baring, Thomas (Huntingdon)	Brownrigg, J. Studholme
Baring, Rt. Hon. W. B. (Thetford)	Bruce, Lord Ernest (Marlborough)
*Barnard, Edward George	*Buller, Charles (Liskeard)
Barrington, Viscount	*Buller, Edward (Staffordshire)
*Bellew, Richard Montesquieu	*Busfield, William

- \*Butler, Pierce Somerset
- \*Byng, Rt. Hon. George Stevens  
Campbell, Sir Hugh (Berwickshire)  
Cardwell, Edward
- \*Carew, Hon. Robert S. (Waterford)  
Carew, William Henry Pole (Cornwall)  
Carnegie, Hon. Captain
- \*Cavendish, Hon. C. C. (Youghal)
- \*Cavendish, Hon. G. H. (Derbyshire)
- \*Chapman, Benjamin (West Meath)
- \*Childers, John Walbanke
- \*Clay, Sir William  
Clayton, Rice R.  
Clerk, Rt. Hon. Sir George  
Clifton, John Talbot
- \*Cobden, Richard  
Cockburn, Rt. Hon. Sir George
- \*Colborne, Hon. W. N. Ridley
- \*Colebrooke, Sir Thomas Edward
- \*Collett, John (Athlone)
- \*Collins, William  
Coote, Sir Charles H.
- Corry, Rt. Hon. Henry
- \*Cowper, Hon. W. F.
- \*Craig, William Gibson  
Cripps, William
- \*Dalmeny, Lord  
Damer, Hon. Colonel
- \*Dawson, Hon. Thomas V.
- \*D'Eyncourt, Rt. Hon. C. T.  
Dickinson, Francis Henry
- \*Divett, Edward  
Dodd, George
- \*Duncan, Viscount  
Duncombe, Hon. A. (E. Retford)
- \*Dundas, Admiral (Greenwich)  
Eastnor, Viscount
- \*Ellice, Rt. Hon. Edward (Coventry)  
Emlyn, Viscount  
Escott, Bickham
- \*Esmonde, Sir Thomas
- \*Etwall, Ralph
- \*Ferguson, Colonel (Kirkaldy)  
Fitzmaurice, Hon. William  
Flower, Sir James
- \*Forster, Matthew  
Fremantle, Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas
- \*French, Fitzstephen  
Gaskell, James Milnes
- \*Gibson, Thomas Milner  
Gordon, Hon. Captain
- Gore, Montague (Barnstaple)
- \*Gore, Hon. Robert (New Ross)  
Goulburn, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Graham, Rt. Hon. Sir James
- \*Granger, Thomas Colpitts
- \*Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir George
- \*Guest, Sir John  
Hamilton, William J. (Newport)  
Hamilton, Lord Claude  
Harcourt, George Granville
- \*Hatton, Captain Villiers
- \*Hawes, Benjamin  
Heneage, G. H. Walker (Devizes)  
Herbert, Rt. Hon. Sidney  
Hervey, Lord Alfred
- \*Hill, Lord Marcus  
Hogg, James Weir
- \*Hollond, Robert  
Hope, Hon. Charles (Linlithgowshire)  
Hope, George William (Southampton)  
Houldsworth, Thomas
- \*Howard, Hon. C. W. G. (Cumberland)
- \*Howard, Hon. Ed. G. G. (Morpeth)
- \*Howick, Viscount
- \*Hutt, William  
Ingestre, Viscount  
James, Sir Walter C. (Hull)  
Jermyn, Earl  
Jocelyn, Viscount  
Johnstone, Sir John (Scarborough)
- \*Labouchere, Rt. Hon. Henry
- \*Lambton, Hedworth  
Lascelles, Hon. W. S.
- \*Lemon, Sir Charles  
Lennox, Lord Arthur  
Lincoln, Earl of
- \*Listowel, Earl of
- \*Loch, James  
Lowther, Sir John Henry (York)  
Lyall, George
- \*Macaulay, Rt. Hon. Thomas B.  
Mackinnon, William Alexander  
Macnamara, Major  
M'Geachy, Forster Alleyne  
M'Neill, Duncan
- \*Mangles, Ross Donnelly  
Manners, Lord John (Newark)  
March, Earl of
- \*Martin, John (Tewkesbury)  
Martin, C. Wykeham (Newport)  
Milnes, Richard Monckton

- \*Mitalfe, Henry
- \*Mitchell, Thomas Alexander
- \*Morison, General (Clackmannan)
- \*Murray, Alexander
- \*Napier, Sir Charles
- Neville, Ralph
- Nicholl, Rt. Hon. John
- Norreys, Lord
- \*O'Connor Don
- \*Ord, William
- Oswald, Alexander (Ayrshire)
- \*Paget, Colonel (Beaumaris)
- Pakington, John S.
- \*Palmerston, Viscount
- \*Parker, John
- Patten, John Wilson
- \*Pechell, Captain
- Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert
- Peel, Jonathan
- \*Philips, George R. (Poole)
- \*Pigot, Rt. Hon. David (Clonmel)
- \*Plumridge, Captain
- Praed, William T.
- Pringle, Alexander
- \*Pulsford, Robert
- Pusey, Philip
- \*Rawdon, Colonel
- Repton, George William John
- \*Rice, Edward Royd
- \*Roebuck, John Arthur
- Round, John (Maldon)
- Rous, Hon. Captain
- \*Russell, Lord John (London)
- \*Russell, Lord Edward (Tavistock)
- Russell, Charles (Reading)
- Russell, J. D. Watts (Staffordshire)
- \*Rutherford, Andrew
- Sandon, Viscount
- \*Scott, Robert (Walsall)
- Seymour, Sir Hor. Beauchamp
- \*Sheil, Rt. Hon. Richard Lalor
- Tellers for the Ayes, Mr. Young and Mr. Henry Baring.
- \*Shelburne, Earl of
- \*Smith, John Abel (Chichester)
- Smith, Rt. Hon. T. B. Cusack (Ripon)
- Smythe, Hon. George (Canterbury)
- Somerset, Lord Granville
- Somerton, Viscount
- \*Somerville, Sir William M.
- Sotherton, Thomas Henry Sutton
- \*Staunton, Sir George T.
- Stewart, John (Lymington)
- \*Stuart, Lord James (Ayr)
- \*Stuart, W. Villiers (Waterford Co.)
- \*Strickland, Sir George
- \*Strutt, Edward
- Sutton, Hon. Henry M.
- \*Tancred, Henry William
- Tennent, James Emerson
- \*Thornely, Thomas
- \*Towneley, John
- \*Traill, George
- Trench, Sir Frederick W.
- Trevor, Hon. G. Rice
- \*Tufnell, Henry
- \*Tuite, Hugh Morgan
- \*Vane, Lord Harry
- \*Villiers, Hon. Charles
- Villiers, Viscount
- \*Wall, Charles Baring
- \*Warburton, Henry
- \*Ward, Henry George
- \*Wawn, John Twizell
- Wellesley, Lord Charles
- \*Williams, William (Coventry)
- \*Wilshire, William
- Wood, Colonel T. (Middlesex)
- \*Worsley, Lord
- Wortley, Hon. John Stuart (Yorks.)
- Wynn, Rt. Hon. C. W. W. (Montg.)
- \*Wyse, Thomas
- Yorke, Hon. Eliot Thomas (Camb.)
- \*Yorke, Henry Redhead (York)

## NOES.

- Ackers, James
- Acton, Colonel
- Allix, John Peter
- Antrobus, Edmund
- Archdall, Captain Mervyn
- Ashley, Lord
- Bagge, William
- Banks, George
- Baskerville, Thomas B. M.
- Bateson, Thomas
- Beckett, William
- Beresford, Major
- Blackstone, William Seymour
- \*Bouverie, Hon. Edward Pleydell
- Bradshaw, James
- Brisco, Musgrave

- Broadley, Henry  
 Bruce, C. L. Cumming (Elgin)  
 Buck, Lewis W.  
 Buller, Sir John Yarde (Devonshire)  
 Burroughes, Henry N.  
 Chetwode, Sir John  
 Christopher, Robert Adam  
 Codrington, Sir William  
 Cole, Hon. Henry Arthur  
 Colquhoun, John Campbell  
 Colville, Charles Robert  
 Compton, Henry Combe  
 Copeland, Mr. Alderman  
 Darby, George  
 Deedes, William  
 Denison, E. Beckett (Yorkshire)  
 Dick, Quintin  
 Disraeli, Benjamin  
 Douglas, Sir Howard (Liverpool)  
 Douglas, James D. S. (Rochester)  
 \*Duncan, George  
 \*Duncombe, Thomas (Finsbury)  
 Duncombe, Hon. O. (York. N. R.)  
 Du Pré, C. George  
 Eaton, Richard Jefferson  
 Egerton, Sir Philip  
 \*Ellice, Edward (St. Andrew's)  
 Entwistle, William  
 Farnham, Edward Basil  
 Feilden, William (Blackburn)  
 Filmer, Sir Edmund  
 Ffolliott, John  
 Forman, Thomas Seaton  
 Fox, Sackville Lane (Ipswich)  
 Fuller, Augustus Elliott  
 Gore, W. Ormsby (Salop)  
 Gore, William R. Ormsby (Sligo)  
 Goring, Charles  
 Greenall, Peter  
 \*Greenaway, Charles  
 Gregory, William Henry  
 Grogan, Edward  
 Hamilton, J. Hans (Dublin Co.)  
 Hamilton, Geo. Alexander (Dublin U.)  
 Hampden, Renn  
 Hanmer, Sir John  
 Harris, Hon. Captain  
 \*Hastie, Archibald  
 Henley, Joseph Warner  
 Hepburn, Sir Thomas B.  
 Hillsborough, Earl of  
 \*Hindley, Charles  
 Hodgson, Frederick (Barnstaple)  
 Jolliffe, Sir William G. Hylton  
 Jones, Captain (Londonderry)  
 Kemble, Henry  
 Knight, Frederick Winn (Worcester)  
 Law, Hon. Charles Ewan  
 Lefroy, Anthony  
 Lockhart, William  
 Long, Walter  
 Mackenzie, Thomas (Ross, &c.)  
 Maclean, Donald  
 \*M'Taggart, Sir John  
 Mainwaring, Townshend  
 Marton, George  
 Masterman, John  
 Maunsell, Thomas Philip  
 Maxwell, Hon. James Peirce  
 \*Morris, David  
 Mundy, Edward Miller  
 Neeld, Joseph (Chippenham)  
 Newdegate, Charles Newdigate  
 Newry, Viscount  
 O'Brien, A. Stafford (Northampton)  
 Packe, Charles William  
 Palmer, Robert (Berkshire)  
 Palmer, George (Essex)  
 Pollington, Viscount  
 Rendlesham, Lord  
 Richards, Richard  
 Round, Charles Gray (Essex)  
 Ryder, Hon. Granville D.  
 Sanderson, Richard  
 Sibthorp, Colonel  
 Smith, Abel (Herts)  
 Smyth, Sir Henry (Colchester)  
 Spooner, Richard  
 Stuart, Henry (Bedford)  
 Taylor, Edward (Dublin Co.)  
 Tollemache, John (Cheshire)  
 \*Turner, Edmund (Truro)  
 Turnor, Christopher (Lincolnshire)  
 Tyrell, Sir John Tyssen  
 Verner, Colonel  
 Vyvyan, Sir Richard R. (Helston)  
 Waddington, Harry S.  
 Wyndham, Colonel C.

Tellers for the Noes, Sir Robert Harry Inglis and Mr. Plumptre.

When it is considered that, on former occasions, the Minorities who voted against the Annual Grant did not exceed the number of forty or fifty, it was considered as manifesting a much stronger feeling against the Bill than had been anticipated, that 114 Members should vote against *the First Reading*,—which often is allowed to pass, almost as a matter of course. The Committee, therefore, published immediately the following advertisement :—

#### CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE.

The Committee, having made themselves acquainted with the proceedings in the House of Commons last evening, lose not an instant in calling on their fellow-Protestants throughout the three kingdoms for renewed, earnest, and united exertion. On the mere introduction of the Bill, and before the voice of the Country could possibly be heard on the great question, they could not have expected so strong a division in their favour; they accept it as an auspicious indication from Divine Providence, at the moment when encouragement was chiefly needed; and they now urge the most determined resistance in every Constitutional way; not only, as before, from a deep sense of duty, but with the animating conviction, that they will succeed if they labour in union for success.

From the tenor of the debates last evening, and especially from the speech of Lord John Russell, it is evident, that leading Statesmen contemplate endowing the whole Roman Priesthood of Ireland, should the present measure be successful.

The Committee, therefore, earnestly entreat their friends, by congregational, parochial, and municipal Meetings, by Petitions to Parliament, by correspondence with their respective Representatives, by the free and intelligent use of the press, and by every other means of enlightening and influencing the public mind, to assist in calling forth and securing the most decided opposition to this unjust, unprincipled, and dangerous measure.

On behalf of the Committee,

CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman*.

JAMES LORD, *Secretary*.

*April 4th, 1845.*

Sir R. Peel, after the Division on the first Reading, gave notice, that he should move the Second Reading of the Bill on Friday, April 11th. The Hon. C. Villiers, who had voted with him for the introduction of the Bill, on the next evening (Friday, 4th) earnestly requested a fortnight's delay, in order to give time for the presentation of Petitions: but Sir R. Peel replied, "that it was certainly his intention to move that the Bill should be read a second time on the Friday following,"—thus allowing *only a week* for the preparation and presentation of Petitions, before the House should be pledged to the principle of the Bill! And when Mr. Plumptre said, "he earnestly hoped that, as the Bill was not yet before the Country, a more extended interval would be allowed before the Second Reading," it does not appear that Sir R. Peel had even the courtesy to give him any reply! There was, therefore, not a moment to be lost. The Committee felt, that every effort must be made

to rouse Protestants, in all parts of the Country, to *immediate* action. They accordingly drew up the following circular, to be signed, not only by members of the Committee, but also by any who desired to aid the Protestant Cause at this crisis, and who were willing to address it to their friends in different places, with the hope of quickening their exertions:—

*Office of the Anti-Maynooth Committee, London Coffee House,  
Ludgate Street, London, Monday, April 7th, 1845.*

DEAR SIR,—The state of the question in Parliament about endowing Maynooth requires the utmost exertion on the part of Protestants.

By energy the Country may be saved.

Our object is to get favourable divisions at the future stages of the Bill—above all, on the Second Reading—on Friday next.

Sir Robert Peel has actually refused more time for the Country to express itself!!

For this purpose, nothing will answer but Protestant Deputations to the Members from their constituents.

Now will you, the instant you receive this, convene the friends of the Gospel in your place? If there has been a coldness between parties hitherto, do not let it prevent you. We must—we must combine as one man, or our Country is lost!

Having met, would you consider if you cannot send up Deputations to influence your Representatives? Clergymen and Churchmen will, of course, have most weight with Conservatives: Dissenters (ministers and others) and men of their own party, with Liberals. Above all, they must be men of firmness, who will not be trifled with.

Scarcely any Member is hopeless. There is scarcely a Conservative Member who has not, on some occasion, in or out of Parliament, spoken against Popery; and perhaps against the wickedness of giving it Government encouragement. There is scarcely a Liberal who has not, at some time or another, spoken against taxing one set of people for the Religion of another—as they now want to tax Protestants for Popery.

Now, if, without loss of time, the Deputation could be furnished with undeniable DOCUMENTARY proof of these declarations, it would add great weight to their appeals. As there is no time to get up addresses on the part of Constituents to their Members, requesting them to vote against the Endowment of Maynooth, much good will be done by private letters from leading supporters to their respective Representatives. The writers will judge, how far an intimation of an intention to withdraw their votes at the approaching Election, in case the Grant is upheld, may be proper at such a time as this, when it is a question, whether our Country shall renounce the Protestantism of their forefathers, and pay for the inculcation of error.

If the Deputation could be prepared to stay in London some days, or others come up to take their place if they are obliged to leave, it would be well; but with the facilities of travelling now possessed, it is hoped that at all events a Deputation will come to London on the business.

We have no fund out of which to pay expenses—you must manage that in the Country.

Excuse the hurried nature of this communication. Let all our friends pray earnestly and unitedly for us—for your Members—and for our Country—and remember that “England expects EVERY MAN to do his duty.”



The Deputation had better inquire for me here, where I trust you will also address an answer to me by return of post.

Subjoined is a list of the last Division, which may be of use to you.

Believe me, &c.

A Finance Sub-Committee was also formed, which drew up the following Circular,—to be transmitted, in a similar manner, by friends of the Cause, to any whom they might be able to influence:—

#### CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE.

*London Coffee House, Ludgate Hill,  
London, April 7th, 1845.*

#### FINANCIAL SUB-COMMITTEE.

SIR,—The circumstances of peril in which the Country is placed, in consequence of the proposed increased Grant to the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, and the hasty manner in which Sir Robert Peel has expressed his determination of pressing this measure through Parliament, imperatively call for a combined and *promptly vigorous effort*, on the part of all who have at heart the honour and glory of God, the truth as it is in Jesus, and the safety of our beloved Constitution.

The expenses of such a movement as ours must necessarily be great, and the activity of our Committee must be impeded for want of funds, if they are not speedily supplied. We trust, therefore, that you will cheerfully and promptly respond to our appeal, and strengthen our hands in this most important work, by freely contributing to the CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE FUND, at Messrs. STRACHAN and Co.'s, 217, Strand; and at the Committee Room, as above.

CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman.*

JOHN DEAN PAUL, *Treasurer.*

JAMES LORD, *Secretary.*

I trust you will assist us.

Believe me, &c.

This appeal was not uncalled for. Few are aware of the difficulty of getting large bodies of men, scattered over a whole Country, into combined action, within a limited period. Sir R. Peel knew well, that much was to be gained by precipitation; that very many would be deterred from acting at all, under the impression that no time was allowed to arrange effectual opposition; and that many more would be deliberating and considering what to do, till the time for action was past. In order to cope with the difficulties arising from this precipitation, immense exertions were required; and, had far more ample funds been placed at the disposal of the Committee, and could more agents have been found to give themselves wholly to the work at this crisis, it is now evident, that a much larger amount of opposition might have been elicited. In particular, much more might have been done in the way of publications, to communicate authentic information to the public, in regard both to the instruction given at Maynooth, and to the practical

working of the system, as proved by the conduct and influence of the priesthood trained in that institution.\* It may, perhaps, be added, that much more might have been done to influence individual Members of Parliament, had more time been allowed, and more agents been at work in various directions. It is, however, wonderful, that, under so many disadvantages, so much was done; and that persons, who had never acted together on any former occasion, should have been enabled to work together so cordially and efficiently, when thus suddenly brought into combination. It is matter of devout and humble thankfulness to God, and afforded striking evidence of the uniting power of true Religion.

It was at this period, that *the grand struggle* might be considered as really commencing. The Bill having been introduced, and read a first time in the House of Commons, the nature, character, and tendency of the measure proposed by the Government, were now before the Public, and fully understood; and the opposition, on the part of all Protestants, became, in consequence, much more decided and energetic. Many who had hitherto felt it their duty to pause,—who considered, that it was only showing due respect to the Government and to Parliament, to refrain from petitioning till the measure proposed (in its principle and details) was fairly before the Nation,—now came forward and testified their uncompromising hostility to it. Large and influential Meetings multiplied on every side. It is not possible to specify all that took place, even in the Metropolis; but it is proper to mention that, on Monday evening, April 7th, a very large and respectable Meeting, consisting of nearly two thousand persons, principally belonging to the Dissenting congregations in the East of London, was held in the Eastern Institution, Commercial Road, Sir Culling E. Smith in the Chair.

The same evening an immense Meeting was held in the Amphitheatre at Liverpool. And a Meeting of the British Reformation Society was also held at Hull, at which the subject of Maynooth occupied much attention.

On Tuesday evening, the 8th, Sir C. E. Smith presided at a very large Meeting of Dissenters of all Denominations, in Finsbury Chapel. There could not have been fewer than three thousand persons present.

The same evening, a very large and highly respectable Meeting, numbering nearly two thousand, of the Clergy and inhabitants of the old Manor of Stepney, was held at the Eastern Institution, the Rev. W. W. Champneys, Rector of Whitechapel, in the Chair, supported by almost every Clergyman in the District.

---

\* *It is wise to learn from past defeat, and to prepare, in good time, for a struggle which must evidently soon commence, against the Endowment of the whole of the Romish Priesthood in Ireland.*—EDITOR.

The Committee, while earnestly desirous of using all lawful means, and making every effort of human power, to resist the Bill, were not unmindful of the only true ground of hope, and the real strength of the Christian. They felt that it became them, at this crisis, to publish the following advertisement in the religious papers :—

## PRAYER.

CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE.

*London Coffee House, Ludgate Street, 7th April, 1845.*

THE COMMITTEE are most anxious that all the Friends of Protestantism, in addition to using every constitutional means, by Petitions to Parliament and by communicating with their Representatives, should, in a crisis so important, be most earnest in prayer to Almighty God, that the deliberations of our Senators may be influenced to prevent so great a National sin as the proposed formal Endowment, nay Establishment of Popery, by the incorporation and support of the College of Maynooth.

The Committee very respectfully suggest, that, in all the Services of the next Lord's-day, such Special Prayer should be offered; and doubt not but the propriety and necessity of this proceeding will commend itself to the Ministers of Religion, and to all lovers of the Truth. And if, in addition to this, any united Meetings for such Special Prayer, on another and early day could be held, it would be most desirable.

For the Committee,

CULLING E. SMITH, *Chairman.*JAMES LORD, *Secretary.*

Meanwhile every exertion was made to get more time. The following Resolution was passed by the Committee, Monday, April 7th:—

Resolved, "That, in the judgment of this Committee, it is highly expedient that Deputations from this, and the other bodies engaged in resisting the Endowment of Maynooth, should wait upon Sir Robert Peel, on the general question, and urge the necessity of delay, in order that the mind of the Country may be fully expressed; and that the arrangement of this be left with the Executive Committee."

And in conformity with the above Resolution, on Wednesday, April 9th, a Deputation, consisting of Sir C. E. Smith, C. Hindley, Esq. M.P., the Rev. C. Prest, the Rev. J. Blackburn, the Rev. Dr. Holloway, the Rev. J. T. Robinson, J. D. Paul, Esq., the Rev. W. Chalmers, the Rev. J. Stamp, the Rev. Dr. Townley, and James Lord, Esq., had an interview with Sir Robert Peel, in Downing Street, for the purpose of asking more time before the Second Reading. They represented to him, that the number of Petitions which had been already presented against the measure, and the general feeling pervading the Country, rendered it necessary, in justice to the feelings of the people, that more time should be allowed for the expression of opinion, and for the preparation and presentation of Petitions, before the House was pledged to the principle of the Bill. Sir Robert Peel received the Deputation with much

courtesy, and listened to all their statements and arguments with profound attention ; but he declared his determination, notwithstanding all that could be said, to move the Second Reading of the Bill on the Friday following. He allowed, that giving more time would give opportunity for the presentation of more Petitions. Hereupon, it was asked, " Are we then to understand, that this is what you wish to avoid ? " He answered, that he had great respect for the Petitions of the people ; but seemed to maintain, that a week was quite sufficient for the expression of public opinion ; and that he should have had much more regard to the number of Petitions presented, had he considered them as the spontaneous expression of the sentiments of the people in various parts of the Country ; but that he knew how they were got up, and that they must be considered merely as the echoes of the views of a Committee in London. It was vain to reply (though the reply was obvious) that, whatever had been suggested, or called for, by any Central Body in London, it would have been utterly impossible to call forth anything like the amount of opposition expressed by so vast a number of Petitions, unless the feeling of the Country had been already so fully prepared to respond to that call, that the feeblest voice was sufficient to arouse it :—notwithstanding the strongest remonstrances, and the most solemn warnings, Sir Robert Peel was inflexible. He, doubtless, understood too well the importance of precipitation to the success of his measure, to suffer himself to be deprived of the advantage which it gave him, by yielding to any arguments which the Deputation could adduce.

This appeal to the Prime Minister having proved unsuccessful, on the following day, a Deputation waited upon Lord John Russell, who, as the Leader of the Opposition in the House of Commons, might have *demand*ed time ; and who, as the avowed Champion of the Rights of the People, seemed to be peculiarly called upon, to stand up for their constitutional Right of Petitioning, by using his utmost influence to secure sufficient time for the preparation and presentation of Petitions from all parts of the Country. This Deputation consisted of Sir C. E. Smith, the Rev. J. Blackburn, the Rev. J. Stamp, the Rev. A. S. Thelwall, Dudley Perceval, Esq., and James Lord, Esq. Those gentlemen represented, in very strong terms, the nature and extent of the feeling which prevailed against the Bill ; that at least six thousand Petitions might be expected from various parts of the Country, if only time were allowed ; that the excitement was such, that those who had been public men for twenty-five years had never known anything like it ; that to endeavour to steal a march upon the people, and to evade their constitutional Right of Petitioning, by refusing them time, was treating the Nation like an enemy ; that the *permanent* Endowment of Maynooth was the introduction of an entirely new principle, and would deprive the

people of any future opportunity of resistance ; and that, therefore, they had more and stronger reason to demand full time for petitioning now. All these arguments, with many facts in illustration of the state of feeling on the subject, were earnestly and respectfully laid before his Lordship : but in vain. The advocate for the Rights of the People was resolutely bent on resisting those Rights. One while he endeavoured to evade the request, by stating that he was not the proposer of the Bill, and that six weeks' delay would make no difference. At another time he said, that he was entirely in favour of the Bill ; and that he, therefore, could not ask for any delay, as that would be the greatest obstacle to its passing—the likeliest way of defeating it. His Lordship was consistent in nothing, but in a determined refusal to accede to the request of the Deputation. And, if the friends of Protestantism had much reason to be dissatisfied with the conduct of Sir Robert Peel, they had quite as much to be dissatisfied with that of Lord John Russell.

It only remained, therefore, for the Executive Committee to communicate with their friends in the House of Commons, and to entreat them to throw every hinderance in the way of the Second Reading which the forms of the House allowed ; which some of them were understood to pledge themselves to do. And it afterwards appeared, that, upon mutual consultation, the Members who were opposed to the Bill deemed it best, to gain time for the presentation of Petitions, by protracting the Debate night after night.

Meanwhile, the refusal of further time before the moving of the Second Reading appeared to stimulate the activity of Protestants, inso-much that on Friday, April 11th, not less than 2400 Petitions against the Bill were presented,—some of which, notwithstanding the shortness of the time allowed for preparation, were very numerously signed.\*

On that evening, on the Second Reading of the Bill being moved, J. C. Colquhoun, Esq., M.P. for Newcastle-under-Lyne, opposed the Bill, on political grounds, and pointed out that *these alone* were fully sufficient for rejecting it. He concluded by moving, that the Bill should be read a second time that day six months. Hereupon followed a Debate which was protracted through six nights of discussion, and finally closed on Saturday morning, April 19th.

Of this long debate it would be impossible to give even an outline. But the speech of Mr. W. E. Gladstone, M.P. for Newark, must not be entirely passed over. This was looked for with much expectation, on account of that Right Hon. Gentleman's retirement from Office, and the speech which he had made on the opening of the Session. It

---

\* The Petition from members of the Church of England, at Manchester, (presented on the preceding evening) was signed by 19,082 persons.

was one of the most extraordinary speeches which ever was delivered; and certainly could satisfy no one. The Right Hon. Member demolished every argument which had been adduced in support of the Bill, and yet concluded by giving it his cordial and unqualified support!! The Record Newspaper (of Monday, April 14th,) made the following apt remarks on this speech :—

“Mr. Gladstone’s speech seems, when calmly considered, almost to outdo all his other inconsistencies. It ends with a vote in favour of Sir Robert Peel’s measure; but, throughout, it argues on the other side; demolishing with great power, most of the pleas advanced in favour of the Government plan.

“Mr. Gladstone begins by a general declaration, that ‘the reasons advanced in support of the measure appear to me, taken as they stand, *to be inadequate to its support.*’ He then alludes to Sir Robert Peel’s speech, and again speaks of ‘pleas which I believe to be unreal and unsubstantial.’

“Next he speaks with absolute indignation of Lord Sandon’s notion, that the Grant is a kind of ‘restitution.’ He says, ‘I disclaim it in every point of view, I disclaim it with reference to the Constitution, I disclaim it on the ground of everything I know of History.’

“Thirdly he discountenances the expectations of those who expect to raise the character of the priesthood; remarking, that the priests are at present ‘taken from the class which can best supply the requisite number.’

“Fourthly, he stigmatises as ‘nothing less than ridiculous’ the argument used in the *Standard* and the *Herald*, that the augmentation of Maynooth will serve to extend Protestantism.

“And lastly, he observes, that there is no other religious Endowment held, either by the Church or by any other body, in England, or elsewhere, ‘on such *easy terms* as this is proposed to be given.’

“And, after all this, on what does Mr. Gladstone ground his support of the Bill? On nothing, that we can discern, except the naked fact, which he two or three times repeats, that ‘it will be a very great boon’ to the Irish Romanists.”

This speech, however, commenced with important admissions. Having referred to the opposition of Sir Robert H. Inglis, Mr. Gladstone said :

“I fully admit that *the minority* of last week *did represent the general and prevailing sense of the majority of the people of England and Scotland.* (Cheers.) But making that admission, and believing, indeed, that *the fact is too notorious to admit of denial, or even of doubt,* I at the same time must state, for my own part, that, after the most full and mature consideration of the subject, in the position in which it stands, I am prepared—in *opposition to what I believe to be the prevailing opinion of the people of England and Scotland*—IN OPPOSITION TO THE SENSE OF MY OWN CONSTITUENTS, from whom I deeply regret to differ—and in opposition to my own deeply-cherished predilections—I am prepared to give a deliberate and anxious support to the measure of the Government.”

These admissions were very remarkable, and very important,—coming from a person so well informed and so intelligent as the Right Hon. Member, and made (as they must have been made) most reluctantly.

Another expression was used by Mr. Gladstone, which occasioned much, and very proper animadversion. He spoke of Protestantism, repeatedly, as a "merely *negative* system;" and quoted a similar expression from Mr. Burke. This had been replied to, by anticipation, a year before, in a work published by the Protestant Association :\* and it was repeatedly referred to, by different speakers, at various public Meetings.

This Debate, which commenced on the 11th, was renewed on Monday, April 14th ; and continued night after night, till Friday, April 18th. .

In the mean time various public Meetings were held, and Petitions against the Measure continued to pour into the House. Some of these Meetings deserve to be particularly mentioned.

On Monday morning, a Public Meeting of the Citizens of London was held at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate Street, in compliance with a requisition addressed to the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor, signed by upwards of one hundred of the Merchants, Bankers, and Traders of the City, requesting his Lordship to call a Meeting of those who were opposed to the Endowment, out of the National Treasury, of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, for the purpose of Petitioning the Legislature against that measure.

Some time before the business commenced, the large room of the Tavern was completely filled; and, although the Meeting was a public one, and no tickets were required to procure admission, and notwithstanding the height to which party feeling was then running, the proceedings were of the most orderly description, and no serious interruption took place in the course of them.

Shortly after twelve o'clock, the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor entered the room amidst considerable applause, accompanied by Messrs. Wheelton, (late Sheriff,) J. Labouchere, T. Pewtress, M. Gould, J. J. Cummins, A. Moore, Lowe, Curling, D. W. Wire, R. Boothby, Roberts, Ridley, Sewell, Blackett, Coats, Rolls, Fry, Gull, Gordon, Farmer, Gillespie, Mills, D. W. Harvey, the Rev. M. Gibbs, the Rev. J. Pratt, the Rev. Dr. Bunting, the Rev. Dr. Alder, &c.

---

\* "To say that *Protestantism* is a merely negative system, shows great ignorance, even of the meaning of language. To *disbelieve*, or to *deny*, may be a mere negative; but no man *protests* against anything, until he apprehends it to be contrary to, or inconsistent with, some great and important principle which he maintains and loves. To be a *Protestant*, therefore, it is necessary (if we attach any meaning to that word) to know so much of the Romish system, and to be so far established in the knowledge of Scriptural and Evangelical truth, as to understand and feel, that the value and importance of the *latter* lay us under a solemn obligation to oppose and denounce the *former*. No man, therefore, can be really and truly a Protestant—can be worthy of that name—unless he has some knowledge (sound and correct, so far as it goes) of the Romish controversy."—*The Idolatry of the Church of Rome. By the Rev. A. S. Thelwall.*

The Right Hon. the Lord Mayor having been called to the Chair, his Lordship explained the purpose of the Meeting. He trusted, that whatever should be said at that Meeting would be said in a Christian spirit, and that they would confine themselves to the single object before them, without any allusion to party politics or personalities. (Cheers.)

Mr. J. Labouchere then proposed the first Resolution :—

“That this Meeting regards with the deepest repugnance and apprehension, the proposition just submitted to Parliament by Her Majesty’s Ministers, for the permanent Endowment of the Romish College of Maynooth; considering that measure to involve a distinct renunciation of the national Protestantism, to which it would humbly ascribe that Divine blessing, which has raised Great Britain to its present elevation of power, wealth, and prosperity.”

Mr. Labouchere, however,

“Did not argue against the Bill upon secular or political motives; he opposed it solely upon religious grounds, as a member of the Church of England, subscribing to that Article, (the nineteenth,) which stated, that the Church of Rome had erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith. (Cheers.) Subscribing conscientiously to the Articles of the Protestant religion, and holding the Invocation of Saints, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation, to be idolatrous and superstitious, he could not support the Endowment of a College, whose object was, to educate and send forth men, to disseminate those doctrines, which he believed to be fraught with danger to the everlasting interests of mankind.” (Cheers.)

Mr. M. Gould seconded the Resolution, which was carried almost unanimously, two hands only being held up against it.

Mr. J. J. Cummins proposed the Second Resolution :—

“That this Meeting, contemplating the measure in the light in which it is viewed by the leading Statesmen, on both sides of the House of Commons, as the first step to the Establishment of the Romish priesthood in Ireland, is of opinion, that—before attempting the introduction of so great a change in the national policy—there should have been offered, on the part of its promoters, some distinct explanation of the course intended to be pursued on the great question of religious Endowments. And, without implying or admitting that such a question ought to be entertained at all, this Meeting considers, that those who have propounded the present measure should at least explain, whether their object is to establish two Religions in Ireland, or three, or what number.”

In proposing this Resolution, Mr. Cummins observed :—

“That he felt that this Country had arrived at a crisis well deserving the attention of every British subject—of every true Protestant—of every real philanthropist. For the last forty years, we had been discussing questions of concessions to various Denominations of Religion, and especially to the Roman Catholics, which professed to be founded upon grounds of liberality, of national faith, and of equal privileges. Whatever might have been his own particular opinion, he felt that they had now arrived at a point where such questions ceased; and where, just because they did



cease, a great national sin commenced. (Cheers.) Strongly attached as he was to the general political principles of those in power, he need scarcely tell them how deeply grieved he was, that he should ever have been called upon to oppose such a measure as this. Entertaining the sentiments that he did, however, he should be acting neither an honest nor a conscientious part, did he not thus clear himself, as an individual, from any participation in this crime." (Loud cheers.)

Ambrose Moore, Esq., seconded the Resolution.

The Motion was then carried unanimously.

D. W. Harvey, Esq., proposed the next Resolution,—

"And further, this Meeting feels entitled to complain of the unprecedented attempt now making, to force through Parliament, with unusual haste, a measure, including a Grant of the public money, in spite of the deep repugnance so strongly manifested by all classes, degrees, and denominations of the British people."

Mr. Harvey, in speaking upon this Resolution, took a line of argument which was felt by some present to be too much like a direct attack upon the Established Church in Ireland; and an Irish Clergyman who was present inquired, whether, if this course were pursued, he might be permitted to reply? The Chairman, hereupon, felt himself obliged to interfere, in order to keep the speaker to the question. He yielded to the decision of the Chair, and concluded by saying:—

"Let it not be said that he, cherishing old animosities, was opposing Sir R. Peel's Government. No; he came there in the spirit of that Resolution, to assert the sovereignty of the people; to oppose every measure which offended the feelings of their hearts, or committed an act of plunder upon their pockets." (Cheers.)

Thomas Hamilton, Esq., seconded the Resolution, which was carried unanimously.

On the Motion of Mr. Wheelton, seconded by Mr. Ridley, a Petition to the House of Commons, founded upon the foregoing Resolutions, was adopted; and

On the Motion of the Rev. Dr. Bunting, seconded by T. Farmer, Esq., a vote of thanks was unanimously passed to the Lord Mayor, for his conduct in the Chair.

His Lordship briefly acknowledged the compliment, and the Meeting separated, a large proportion of the assembly having first signed the Petition which had been agreed to.

On the evening of the same day, (Monday, April 14th,) in pursuance of a public advertisement, "an aggregate Meeting of Protestants of all Denominations, to protest against the Establishment of Popery," was held in Covent-Garden Theatre. A considerable number of respectably dressed persons were assembled at each entrance, long previous to the opening of the doors; and before the appointed hour of meeting, the theatre was densely crowded in every part, not excepting the stage, which was occupied almost exclusively by gentlemen, many of whom

appeared to be Clergymen. The ladies present on this occasion formed comparatively but a small portion of the assembly. And, as this was probably the largest Meeting held on this question, it is right to give some account of it.

The Chair was taken at Seven o'clock by

"Mr. R. C. L. Bevan, (of the banking firm of Barclay, Bevan, and Co.,) who, after the reading of the forty-sixth Psalm by the Rev. C. Prest, and the offering up of a prayer by the Rev. Dr. Holloway, addressed the Meeting. The Chairman read letters from the Rev. J. T. Robinson, Rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn; the Honourable and Rev. Montagu Villiers, Rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury; and from Mr. Fox Maule, M.P., concurring in the object of the Meeting, and expressing a hope that it might be attended with successful results. On coming to a passage in Mr. F. Maule's letter, in which that Gentleman expressed surprise, that such a measure should emanate from the present Government, the Chairman proceeded to observe that that was a point on which he felt very sorely. (Hear, and a laugh.) He had supported the cause of the present Government with his exertions and his money, because he thought he was supporting the cause of Religion; but he had found out his mistake. (Laughter.) They might laugh if they pleased, but he would never do it again." (Cheers, and laughter.)

The Rev. Dr. Croly came forward to move the first Resolution, which he did in a long and eloquent speech, which was afterwards published at full length, as he intended to have delivered it. It must suffice here to give a mere sketch of it. Dr. Croly commenced by saying,—

"Mr. Chairman, I have the honour to be requested to propose the following Resolution:—

"That as it has pleased Almighty God to place our beloved Country, since its Reformation from Popery, first amongst the kingdoms of Europe for wealth, power, and liberty, so it would be, in the judgment of this Meeting, a fearful dereliction of duty, and an act of base ingratitude to the Supreme Ruler of Nations, to abandon those Protestant principles which have been the foundation of our Country's prosperity, and of the still higher blessings of our Civil and Religious freedom."

Dr. Croly then went on to state,—

"That they were assembled there to defend the faith which had been won for them by their ancestors—that faith which, if it fell into the power of their enemies, would only precede them to the scaffold; and, if they suffered its grave to be dug, would have the prosperity of the Country flung in after it. It was now nearly ten years since he had been under that roof, for the purpose of sustaining Protestant principles, at a period when they appeared to have sunk to the lowest ebb, and when the whole Country was in a state of the greatest difficulty. They did not shrink then, and he hoped they would not now."

Here there was some noise and interruption, whether proceeding from a feeling of dissent, or from the idea, which was subsequently expressed, that the Rev. gentleman was not confining himself to the purpose of the Meeting, it was difficult to say.

"He wished to have the good feeling of every one present, but he would not be put down by any. (Hear, hear.) At that period Popery had made fearful encroach-

ments—had got into the Ministry, and advanced to the foot of the Throne. They appealed to the Nation, whose voice was raised in vindication of Religion and of Truth, and they carried the day. He once more appealed to that voice, magnanimous, universal, and irresistible, and for the same object. (Cheers.) He rejoiced to find that the Chapel and Cathedral were united, and that in every part of the Country, and amongst every class, there was a firm determination that there should be ‘no surrender.’ (Cheers.) He had been asked to give an historical view of the effects of Popery in this Country, and he would attempt to do so. It was twenty years since that view first occurred to him; and during that period, he had seen from day to day additional reasons for relying upon the fidelity of it. England, beyond all other nations of the world, had been made the depository of Religion and Truth; but from the time she became a Kingdom, until the Reformation, she might be said to have been in slavery. (Cries of ‘No.’) He spoke of facts. With the Reformation came a total change. Elizabeth, that most magnanimous Queen, declared for Protestantism. In the next reign a Popish conspiracy arose, but it was overthrown, and the King and Commons of the Country were saved from a fearful explosion of a gunpowder plot. Then came the reign of Charles, a splendid Sovereign, and just the one for raising a nation; but he made a Popish alliance, he brought up his two sons in Popery; and, as if the lightning of heaven had fallen upon the diadem of England, and blasted its splendour, Charles was the first of the kings of this Country who perished upon the scaffold. Next came Cromwell, a guilty man, no doubt, because he had stained his hands unnecessarily in blood; but still a great man, who redeemed by his glories as a king his errors as a subject. Then followed the second Charles, a weak and superstitious man, but not so deeply criminal as to draw down the vengeance of Heaven on his head; he was not a declared Papist. Then came James, a declared and open Papist, a persecutor, who violated the laws, and insulted the Religion of the Country. What became of him?—He was driven into the most ignominious exile that ever befel a monarch, extinguishing his dynasty,—the last of whom sunk into a monk, and that monk a pensioner of England. Then came a total change, in the accession of a great Protestant king. His titles, power, victory, privileges—all were Protestant. In the strength of that, William swept Europe before him—he died in glory and in honour. These were not casual circumstances, but direct alternatives. As sure as a Protestant king came to the throne, so surely did the Country rise; as sure as a Papist King, or a King whose councils were even tinged with Popery, ascended the throne, that instant—however splendid the sun of Empire might be shining—did a cloud come over its brightness, in whose skirts were the thunder and hail. There was one fact in the history of William, which was most memorable—the exclusion of Roman Catholics from the Houses of Parliament. (Cheers, mingled with expressions of dissent.) He laid the axe to the root, he stopped the fountain-head, and left behind him that great measure of his Government as a mark of the wisdom by which a Protestant Constitution had been saved, and as a warning of the danger of permitting encroachments upon the liberty and completeness of that Constitution. The hundred years that followed that reign, with the exception of one or two trivial occurrences, were the most triumphant that any Country in Europe had ever enjoyed.”

The Rev. Gentleman then proceeded to make some remarks condemnatory of the nature and effect of the Emancipation Bill of 1829, but was interrupted by persons who did not seem to coincide with him. He assured the Meeting that he was as far removed from superstition as any man.

"Gentlemen," continued the Rev. speaker, "you must hear me, and you shall hear me, and what is more, you shall hear me with conviction. (Cheers, and laughter.) The Bill of 1829—that unhappy, rash, ill-judged, and fatal measure," (cries of 'No,' which, on repetition, seemed likely to tend to uproar.)

The Chairman at length interfered by stating that the question of Emancipation was one which ought not to be introduced, and he hoped that no further reference would be made to it.

"The Rev. Dr. Croly bowed to the opinion of the chair, although it was by no means his opinion. He was not discussing any measure, he was only stating historical facts. Within twelve months of the passing of that measure of which he was prohibited from giving an opinion, a greater number of extraordinary changes occurred in this Country than ever were known before. The King—a popular King too, soon after he had put his signature to it, was carried from this world. The House of Lords was degraded in the face of the people. The House of Commons—another delinquent—was punished in the most memorable and complete manner that ever occurred in the history of the Legislature. (After some further interruptions, and cries of 'Go on,' the Chairman again interfered, and requested the Rev. Gentleman to confine himself to the question.) He would say no more upon that point, but here was another equally unanswerable. From the moment that those new influences came into the House of Commons they seemed to change the Ministry at will. They sent out Lord Grey, and put in Melbourne, and twice snatched the seals of office from Peel and the Duke of Wellington. They were not met there to plead for new privileges, or for new powers of pressing down any portion of their Country, ('No,' 'Yes,') they were pleading at the bar of public opinion on behalf of Protestantism, and struggling to protect that with which their whole prosperity was connected. He would conclude in the words of the Psalmist:—'Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered; let them also that hate him flee before him. As smoke is driven away, so drive them away; as wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked perish in the presence of God.'"

This is but a very imperfect sketch of the Rev. Dr. Croly's speech; but his views have been long before the Public, and will be found in a Tract, intitled, "Protestantism the Polar Star of England." In some of his views, a large proportion of the Meeting were not prepared to follow him, and some interruption and disturbance took place. But, when such multitudes were so suddenly brought together, who never before had met—who had never so much as thought of acting together on any previous occasion—it is not surprising that, now and then, a difference of opinion and of feeling was manifested. It was rather to be acknowledged, with admiration and thankfulness, that the Meeting, on the whole, was so orderly and harmonious as it proved. Some little time must always be allowed even for Christian men to get acquainted with one another's feelings and views, so as to understand, where and when forbearance must be exercised, what topics may be freely discussed, and what it is desirable to avoid.

The Rev. John Blackburn seconded the Resolution.

"He rose, as an Independent Minister, to second the Resolution, but not entirely to support the speech of the Rev. Gentleman who had preceded him. They had come there to assert, not a positive but a negative principle; and that principle was, that they would not have Popery established in Ireland. He had been accustomed to call himself a Whig, and like the Chairman towards another leader, he was prepared to say to the Noble Lord who led the Whigs, 'I really know not what has come to you.' That party said that they were supporting the present proposal of Ministers as a matter of religious freedom—that was, to allow a man to think, and speak, and act as he pleased; but it is no religious freedom (said the Rev. Gentleman) to put your hands into my pockets. Lord J. Russell had no Church preferment; he condescended to become curate to Sir R. Peel, and to publish the banns of marriage between Great Britain and the Church of Rome. But they had come there that evening to forbid the banns. The restoration of the Order of the Jesuits, the effects of which were now being felt throughout Europe, was an additional reason why the Protestants of the Country ought to stand more united and firm, and resist any further encroachment of those most wily emissaries of Rome."

Having again declared that he considered it most unjust to take the money of one man and give it to support another man's religious opinions, the Rev. Gentleman concluded by seconding the Resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Rev. J. Sherman, Minister of Surrey Chapel, proposed the Second Resolution:—

"That the Proposal of Her Majesty's Government, formally to endow the College of Maynooth, for the education of the Romish Priesthood of Ireland, at the expense of the United Kingdom, is a measure which this Meeting feels constrained, by every principle of Religion, to oppose by all the means of resistance which the Laws and Constitution of these Realms will permit; and that the following Petition to the House of Commons be therefore adopted."

The Rev. Gentleman prefaced his observations by saying, that

"He had no feeling against Roman Catholics—he did not think them aliens, and he would extend to them the enjoyment of every civil right. No man had a right to interfere with conscience, for conscience was God's. If a Roman Catholic was sincere, he had not only a right to his opinions, but also a right to propagate them,—for religious liberty was nothing without this. Still he, as a Protestant, had an equal right to all this; and, in the exercise of that right, even Roman Catholics would hold him a recreant to his own principles, if, in doing so, he did not do all in his power to oppose Roman Catholicism as a damnable heresy. But how would he seek to convert the Roman Catholics?—By the power of the Gospel—by the grace of the Spirit—by a heart full of Christian love towards him. But if the Roman Catholics—no, he begged the Roman Catholics' pardon—if Sir R. Peel came to him and said, 'Mr. Sherman, I have a great number of Roman Catholics in Ireland whom I don't know what to do with; let me put my hand into your pocket, that I may have an increased Grant in order to get a spiritual police there,'—if this request was made to him, his answer would be, 'Not while I am a man.' Mr. O'Connell spoke of Peel and Repeal at his Meetings, and said that he would take the Maynooth Grant only as the first instalment of future concessions. He could conceive with what gratification

Sir R. Peel must have received, some days ago, the thanks of twelve Roman Catholic Bishops for his measure of liberality to Ireland. He recollected where he was standing, and he owned that it was the first time he had ever appeared upon 'the boards.' He also recollected, that a great and noble Statesman derived large and princely revenues from the neighbourhood of Covent Garden. He remembered, too, that that Statesman had once said, that he hoped to see the day when Popery would be endowed in Ireland; but, knowing that the immense fortunes of his family were collected from the ruined property of the Roman Catholic Church, would it not have been far more generous, if not more just, had he talked of defraying this additional Grant out of that private fund, instead of imposing it as a burden on this Protestant nation? With regard to Sir R. Peel, he was powerful by his position, and by his great personal influence; but there was a principle at work in this Country more mighty than he,—the power of public opinion; and he trusted that it would be asserted with a strength and perseverance before which the Premier would be compelled to yield."

The Rev. W. Chalmers seconded the Resolution.

"He argued that the Nation had a right to demand, that the system should be investigated before it was paid for. The grand question is, How can man be justified before God? The Bible told them to look to the blood of the Lamb, but the Roman Catholic religion directed its votaries to masses, and to purgatory, and to the superadded merits of saintly interference. He could quote the history of Europe to show that that Church had been the great enemy of knowledge—witness the *Index Expurgatorius*; that she had been the foe of domestic virtue—witness the celibacy of the Clergy; that she had always persecuted the cause of Civil Liberty. He quoted Mr. Inglis's book with respect to the education of Maynooth, in order to show, that the effect of it was, to make the priests Popish to the backbone, and to impress them with a profound sense of their own influence and importance. Now Sir R. Peel had taken no means of correcting or restraining that course of education. The visitors of the College were to be Roman Catholic; and surely, compassion for the souls of their poor Irish fellow-subjects ought to induce them to oppose the Grant. Yet they were called upon by a Protestant Government, to be so reckless of their fellow-subjects in Ireland, as to subject them to the influence of priests educated in a system, which a famous German divine, converted from Popery, had so powerfully denounced. He could not see how increasing Irish Priests would increase their potatoes; or how it was to lead the people to higher or nobler aspirations. Even if this measure were to be followed by calm, and smiles, and peace in Ireland, he would regret that such should be purchased by the conciliation of Rome. He had read in the dark annals of the Inquisition, that a victim who had recanted, and was led to believe that he was to be reconciled to the bosom of Mother Church, approached to embrace the image of the Virgin, when suddenly the arms of the figure opened, and receiving him into her embrace, a hundred knives pierced him to the heart. And so he warned them now, that conciliation at the expense of Protestantism would be death to the people of Ireland. It was said, that the Roman Catholic religion was changed, that it had become humanized by the diffusion of general knowledge, and that the power of the press would control the evil influences which it still retained; but would any Roman Catholic confess that his infallible Church had undergone any alteration? No; and he warned them of the danger of Protestantism, which would result from a measure that was sharpening the weapons of Popery, and enabling that despotic power to collect its whole energies for the destruction of liberty—civil and religious.

He did not know that the Petitions now getting up might be crowned with success, but he hoped and believed, that the present would be but the commencement of a continued and powerful agitation, which would be perpetuated until it had triumphed over every obstacle."

The Resolution having been put and carried unanimously, the Rev. Dr. Dixon moved the following Resolution:—

"That, as citizens of a free Country, and prizing the advantages of a constitutional Government, this Meeting must protest against every interference with the undoubted right of Petitioning, by an attempt to hurry an important measure through Parliament, with such precipitation as leaves no opportunity to vast bodies of the people to express their opinions on its character and principles."

"I am," said the Rev. Gentleman, "a Methodist preacher; and, if you will permit me, I will try to represent the opinions of something like a million and a-half of Her Majesty's subjects. I suppose that I, and those around me, must make up our minds to be taunted, for our appearance here to-day, with bigotry; but, on a question of this sort, for my own part, I wish to be a deep-dyed bigot. When I say that, let my fellow-subjects of Ireland know, that there is not a spark of animosity in my heart towards them:—that, as a Nation, they have my admiration; that their generosity, their warmth, their eloquence, their poetry,—everything which goes to constitute their character,—just with the exception of their Roman Catholicism,—I admire. We shall, by our proceedings to-day, I doubt not, in high places, (though we are not in Exeter Hall, but in Covent Garden Theatre)—be stigmatised as narrow-minded persons. For myself, I take my position by the side of the Reformation,—by the side of Queen Victoria,—by the side of the Protestant Constitution of the Country. I know not whether it is permitted, on these boards, for private persons to remark upon the Debates in the House of Commons. If I enjoy that liberty, I will venture upon a remark or two on the speech of the Right Hon. Wm. Gladstone. I find that Gentleman taunting his friend, the Hon. Baronet, the Member for Oxford, with the sort of company into which he (Sir Robert Inglis) was falling,—alluding to the two opinions maintained by the petitioners to the House of Commons,—some of whom thought it wrong to admit the principle of Endowments at all, and others only that it was wrong to endow Popery. I enter not into that question; but I should like to ask Mr. Gladstone, what sort of company he is falling into? We are satisfied with ourselves to-day: those Gentlemen who hold the Endowment of Religion at all to be improper, are most assuredly right in opposing this Grant;—nothing can logically be said against them;—the followers of John Howe, and other eminent persons of that class, cannot be accused of acting inconsistently, when they come forward to oppose the Endowment of Popery;—whether persons holding the Endowment Principle can make out their case, is a question—don't stop me,—it is awkward to cut a sentence in two; I have no doubt but the first speaker on this platform, and other Clergymen of the Church of England, holding the principle of Endowments, can make out an equally consistent case in their opposition to endowing Popery. I hail our Meeting to-day;—it augurs good;—I have looked for it;—it is not the first time I have appeared on a platform in vindication of Protestantism against Popery. The time is come when 'the pressure from without' is doing the work that other principles could not do; and we shall not be very easily broken up after our Meeting to-day. But, what of Mr. Gladstone's company? I really stand astonished at public men. Why is he not in the Cabinet? Why leave it on this question? Why not stop to carry into effect principles which he evidently holds? I see Mr.

Gladstone voting with Dr. Bowring, Mr. Hume, and persons as opposite to him in principles and politics as it is possible for men to be. Depend upon it, Mr. Gladstone's companionship is more inconsistent than ours. That Right Hon. Gentleman tells us, in his speech, that Legislation must necessarily be a compromise; and that this question—the Endowment of Popery in Ireland—must be settled upon that principle. If you can find me a sphere of pure and unmixed politics, I agree with the principle. International rights, settlement of boundaries, railroads, the contest between the agriculturists and gentlemen who sometimes occupy this place, may be settled, I presume, on the principle of compromise; but there are some things beyond that;—our principle to-night is beyond that. I have nothing to compromise. Am I to settle the question, as to whether Her Majesty's subjects should read the Bible, on the principle of compromise? I say that the Establishment and Endowment of Popery in Ireland at this time is a highly religious principle. It is not a question of discipline; it is not of Church order; it may involve principles of that sort; but the real point is, whether or not I, an honest Protestant, can give my countenance, and am willing to give my money, to the Endowment of a system of Religion, which, on its own showing and profession, is diametrically opposite to my own? Am I doing the Catholics an injury, in saying that their principles are opposite to my own? I am sure that they would not like me to state, that the doctrines of the Council of Trent and of John Wesley are identical:—to state that the doctrines and sentiments of the Popish Church beautifully harmonise, and sweetly blend, with the Articles of the Church of England and the principles of the Dissenters. Popery takes an isolated position. It professes supremacy, universality, and infallibility; and I don't believe it. Mr. Gladstone admitted, in the House of Commons, that, in his judgment, this measure was being pushed against the principles, opinions, and judgment of the people of England, and of his own constituents: are you prepared to acquiesce in this? Are you prepared to see the measure carried in the House of Commons against the principles of representation? Why have we a Reform Bill?—increased suffrages?—an enlarged basis of constitutional rights? Are we to stand by, and see what is avowedly an obnoxious measure thrust down the throats of the people of England against their will? I trust and hope, that from this Meeting, as from a centre, will arise a voice that shall reach every heart, rouse every conscience, arm every man, and draw out every elector. Let Englishmen take this declaration to their own keeping, preserve it,—recollect it,—and act upon it. There are higher things than party politics; and I trust this movement will lead us to the consideration, that it is quite time for the religious, the Christian and Evangelical public of this Country, to find a basis for themselves. Mr. Gladstone, in his advocacy of the measure before Parliament, said, he could not discover any principle of alliance between the Constitution and Laws of this Country, and that undefined thing called Protestantism. If I have not quoted the passage verbally correct, I have seized the sentiment. Now, I quite differ from that opinion: I believe, that there is a Protestant principle lying at the foundation of everything British, notwithstanding all the concessions that have been made. I give no opinion of these concessions; my business is Maynooth, not Catholic Emancipation; and I can easily perceive the difference between concession of civil rights to Roman Catholics, and the Endowment of their Religious system. But I do say, that all the elements of the English constitution are still Protestant. The Throne of our glorious and honourable Queen Victoria rests, not on the principle merely of Protestant succession, but also on a Protestant oath. Not a Noble Lord enters the House of Peers, but he subscribes an oath on the principle of Protestantism. And



not even a Roman Catholic Member can enter the House of Commons, but he is obliged to take an oath, in no sort to injure the Protestant Institutions of this Country. We have still remaining, and I trust we are prepared to guard it, a noble and glorious basis,—we have a rock of Protestant principle and Protestant truth remaining still; we will keep to that, we will defend it; and I trust the noble principle of my friend Mr. Chalmers, from the North, so spirit-stirringly advocated, will be carried into effect, and that we shall not break up till we have entered into certain Resolutions, that we will perpetuate ourselves, and never cease agitating, on the principle of non-endowment of Popery, keeping to that,—if the measure even should be carried,—till it is blotted from the records of the Nation.

“But I am speaking to the speech of Mr. Gladstone. I find in it the avowal of a fact denied by Sir Robert Peel. Mr. Gladstone, with great frankness, tells us, that the measure is undoubtedly the introduction of a new principle: Sir Robert Peel, in his argument of three heads, tells us, that he is introducing no new principle, but acting upon an old and recognised one. It is no great wonder, that *he* does not know he is introducing a new principle, for a principle must be to him a very strange thing. They are so seldom the companions of each other, that really it is no great wonder, that the Queen’s Prime Minister should mistake the matter, when he introduces, by Act of Parliament, the principle of Endowment and not Annual Vote. However, his talented friend comes to his help, and tells the British public, that it really is the introduction of a new principle, and that we are to look for enlarged developements of the same principle,—meaning, I presume, the time is in contemplation, when the State, (according to the humorous Sydney Smith,) shall be compelled to give, towards the Endowment of Popery, something like £400,000 a-year. Before you go further, lay your fingers on this £28,000. Stop it. Kill the principle. Destroy the root. Pluck up Maynooth altogether. Depend upon it, if you leave the roots of the evil in the ground, they will spring up. I know not who may be made the instrument of revival; but it will be convenient to some parties, to carry out the principle already existing to something like a handsome magnitude. For my own part, I am not prepared to endow Popery.

“I am willing to take up with inferior considerations: but I am quite satisfied with religious considerations; and I ask these questions—What is this Maynooth College? What does it teach? What has it done? Why (in answer to the first question) Maynooth is a rib of Popery, under the dominion and ecclesiastical authority of his Holiness the Pope. Mind, the Minister tells you, that the thing is to be done quite handsomely, and no State supervision to be exercised in connexion with the Grant. This is an anomalous thing. Whenever the State has made a Grant, it has always made the claim of supervision. I appeal to the history of France; who has not read of the Pragmatic Sanction? And in Germany, Spain, and France, at the present time, wherever the Pope is permitted to have any sort of connexion with the people and Country, we always find a corrective check. Just look at the difference between the consideration of the Grant made to the Popish College of Maynooth, and the Scottish Free Church question. When our Scottish brethren sought a little relief, rightly or wrongly does not signify to my argument, the State refused to make any sort of concession,—insisting that, whenever a Religion received support from the State, the State had a right of introducing supervision. You have now a Popish institution to deal with; and I myself heard Sir Robert Peel say, that he intended to give the Grant to Maynooth handsomely, generously, and without restrictive interference,—in no way putting anything upon the College like State supervision. Right or wrong, so it is; and I am

not prepared to acquiesce in the Endowment of an Institution, which is altogether under the dominion of his Holiness. No Roman Catholic has a just right, to object to any investigation regarding this institution.

"Next, I want to know what this institution teaches;—what it teaches, as betwixt his Holiness the Pope and Queen Victoria. Why, will any Roman Catholic deny his Holiness's supremacy? Will any Roman Catholic here deny, that his Holiness claims dominion over every baptized person in the world? Legitimate baptism is not the question; upon the footing of the baptism of heretics, the Roman Catholic books claim a universal dominion for his Holiness. I suppose, in modern times, my Roman Catholic brethren will hardly admit, that he claims secular universal dominion, as well as spiritual. But it is in this book (holding up a volume). This is connected with the claim of infallibility. Now, as a loyal Briton, I am not prepared to consent, that Queen Victoria shall lay her Royal diadem at the feet of the Pope.

"What do they teach with respect to ourselves? They teach explicitly, without equivocation, that we are a body of heretics, to be dealt with on the footing of the laws concerning heretics. I thank God, that in Popery, as in many other things, men are better than their system; that the priesthood of Ireland, and the Roman Catholic population, are better than their system; if they acted upon the principles of their own system, with respect to every Protestant person, we should be treated as heretics,—condemned, coerced, and put in jail. Do you believe in Thomas Aquinas? That celebrated authority teaches the lawfulness of putting heretics to death;—and he is one of the Standards of the College of Maynooth. I enter not into the theological question, though it is deeply interesting and important; but I maintain, that the Protestant system—the system of this Country—and that of Popery are diametrically opposite.

"I want to know this—how Popery treats its own disciples?—Whether, since Maynooth was instituted, those generous, fine-hearted men have been taught to appreciate their position as men, as citizens, as Christians,—as having rights of conscience, rights of education, rights of Religion?—Whether these are conceded by the priest or not?—Whether they are approaching anything towards individual liberty? I say, in the presence of this great assembly of Englishmen, that there is not a purer, or a more dire and horrible system of tyranny and slavery in this world—I mean towards its own people—than Popery. Educate men to keep my fellow-subjects in a state of prostrate bondage to a priestly despotism!—I have not wound myself up to a state of feeling to concede that. I want every Irishman to possess his Bible,—to enjoy liberty to read it,—and to worship God as he may think it right, without priestly interference. I am not prepared to see a priesthood to enslave my fellow-subjects.

"And, pray, what has this institution done? Those who instituted it at first thought, it would honestly and really bring us together, make us friends, create conciliation; and England and Ireland would become more than ever one. Has it done so? Look at Mr. O'Connell's last speech. As to giving up agitation, he repudiates it altogether. I also would fight it out; I would go from this Meeting, determined not to give it up; and I conclude by moving, that we make ourselves perpetual, by forming an Anti-Popish Society."

Samuel Blackburn, Esq., seconded the Resolution;

"In doing so, he adverted to the language of Mr. State-conscience Gladstone on a late occasion, when he declared that the great majority of his Countrymen were

opposed to the Bill. It had been stated, that petitioning was a mockery, from the inattention which was paid to it; and he thought that it would indeed soon become so, if the course which Mr. State-conscience Gladstone advocated was carried into effect. He was neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but he thought he could foretell that this Bill would never pass into a Law. As had been said before, so he said now, 'Thank God there is a House of Lords!' but, even if the measure was not withstood there, he believed that their beloved Sovereign, whose Throne was founded in righteousness, would interfere on their behalf, and require from her Ministers the abandonment of a measure destructive to that Protestantism, with which the glory of her Crown and the loyalty of her people were so closely associated."

The Resolution having been carried,  
Sir Culling Eardley Smith then moved—

"That in the event of the Maynooth Bill passing the Second Reading, this Meeting will re-assemble, in order to take into consideration the duty of Protestant electors at the next general Election; that the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee convene such Meeting as speedily as possible, and that, in the mean time, they take such preparatory steps as they may deem advisable."

In proposing the Resolution, Sir C. E. Smith adverted to the charge which he had, ten days ago, brought against Mr. Daniel O'Connell. He then said—

"That Mr. O'Connell had, in his presence, thrown ridicule upon any one who took money out of any other man's pocket for the support of his own Religion. Mr. O'Connell had returned no answer to that assertion; nor had he sheltered himself under any excuse, for having at one time stated, that the Irish Roman Catholic Clergy did not take our money, and, at another time, stating that they should. The present was a most momentous question, but they ought not to despair of success in their efforts. Had no one heard of the diocese of Exeter? Good men, at that time, were told, that it was in vain to contend against authority; but the Protestantism of England stood firm; and it was believed that Sir R. Peel himself was the person who told the Bishop of Exeter, that he should not resist the power of public opinion. Did the Prime Minister think, that what the Bishop was compelled to do in a diocese, he would not also be forced to do in a Nation? On Friday there was no less than 2372 Petitions laid on the table of the House of Commons against the Bill—a fact unprecedented in the history of Parliament. He had heard it said, that it was the intention of the Whigs to throw over Sir R. Peel, and leave him to fight the battle with his own party,—a majority of whom were opposed to him on this question. Sooner or later, too, he felt assured, that their efforts must be successful, as they possessed in their favour the entire approbation of the Country."

The Motion having been seconded by the Rev. Dr. Holloway, and supported by the Rev. Mr. Scales, was then put, and adopted unanimously.

It was then moved by Captain Trotter, and seconded by the Rev. T. Tenison Cuffe—

"That the thanks of this Meeting be given to R. C. L. Bevan, Esq., for his kindness in taking the Chair on this occasion."

This was carried unanimously.

The Chairman briefly acknowledged the vote of thanks: the whole Meeting then united in singing the following hymn :—

“ All hail the power of Jesus' Name !  
Let angels prostrate fall :  
Bring forth the royal diadem,  
And crown Him Lord of all.

“ Crown Him, ye martyrs of your God,  
Who from His altar call :  
Extol the stem of Jesse's rod,  
And crown Him Lord of all.

“ Let every kindred, every tribe,  
On this terrestrial ball,  
To Him all Majesty ascribe,  
And crown Him Lord of all.

“ To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,  
The God whom we adore,  
Be glory, as it was, is now,  
And shall be evermore.”

The Rev. A. S. Thelwall then pronounced the Blessing, and the immense assemblage quietly dispersed.

The effect produced by so vast a multitude uniting, apparently with one heart and voice, in singing this beautiful hymn, was quite overwhelming, and made a most deep and delightful impression. Many were even melted into tears. And when it is considered, that nearly seven thousand people were supposed to be assembled, (at least, when the Meeting was fullest,) that the place is admirably constructed for seeing and hearing to the best advantage, and that (though commonly used for far other purposes,) it was, at least for that evening, consecrated to a religious object, and to the service of God,—sanctified by the Word of God and prayer, and by singing His Praises,—it is not surprising, that many persons felt and acknowledged the singing of that Hymn to be one of the most interesting circumstances connected with the Meeting. The harmony of so many voices was beautiful : how much more, when it might be considered as expressive of the harmony of so many hearts, in the praises of their Redeemer and their God, and in zeal for His honour and glory !

On the same day, at Bristol, a public Meeting for the same object was held at the Victoria Rooms, and was attended by at least one thousand persons.

On the Platform were nearly all the Clergy, and the most distinguished of the laity of Bristol and the neighbourhood.

The Rev. Hugh Stowell, of Manchester, in a very able and animated speech, addressed the Meeting, and was followed by several other Gentlemen. The Meeting was very unanimous, and Petitions to both Houses of Parliament were adopted.

On the following day, a Meeting of the English Roman Catholics was held at the Freemasons' Tavern, at eleven o'clock, to petition Parliament in favour of the Grant to Maynooth College. The Earl of Arundel and Surrey was in the Chair. The Meeting was far from being a large one, the room at no time being more than half full; and, though it was ostensibly a meeting of English Roman Catholics, there were strong reasons for believing, that, in the body of the Hall at any rate, more than four-fifths of the audience were from the sister Island.

The intelligence from Liverpool, on Tuesday, gave the following account of the state of feeling, and the measures adopted there:—

“The opposition to the increased Parliamentary Grant to the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth is rapidly extending in this town and neighbourhood. The Electors are beginning to consider it as the test of the fitness of their Representatives; and, from the proceedings reported below, it will be seen, that the most numerous class of them mean to take up this matter with no common earnestness. A general Meeting of the various Denominations of Dissenters is to be held this evening, to petition against this measure; and, from the alacrity with which they are uniting with Churchmen, we are prepared to see a more unanimous outburst of public opinion here, than has ever been exhibited before on any question, theological or political. The Protestant Operative Society, a body which the Ministerial measure has just roused from nearly absolute dissolution, held a very spirited and enthusiastic Meeting last night in the Music-hall. Upwards of two thousand persons were present, more than one-third of whom were registered Electors of the Borough; and many more were unable to obtain entrance into the room. The Rev. Hugh McNeile, who is Patron of the Society, took the chair. We regret not having room for the speech of the Rev. Chairman. He produced the following declaration, which he urged the Meeting to sign:—

“We, the undersigned, Electors of the Borough of Liverpool, honestly believing the Church of Rome to be in doctrine opposed to the word of God, and in practice subversive of civil and religious liberty, consider all appropriations of public money for its support grossly inconsistent in our professedly Protestant Rulers, and at variance with the duties they owe to their subjects. For these reasons we hereby declare, that no Member of Parliament is entitled to the confidence of a Protestant constituency, who will not firmly oppose the contemplated Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth. April 14th.”

The Rev. J. R. Connor moved, and Mr. Forsyth seconded, the adoption of the above declaration. The Chairman, in putting the motion, said, that under ordinary circumstances he should not have suggested such a pledge, but a crisis had arrived when combination was required, and that, too, in good time, otherwise the Country would be carried down by the whirlpool of Popery. The motion was then carried by

acclamation ; and after one or two speeches more, the meeting adjourned till the following Monday. The declaration was engrossed, and it immediately received the signatures of several hundred electors. These signatures soon amounted to one thousand ; and, at length, it was affirmed, to two thousand.

In London, on Tuesday night, a Meeting was held at Surrey Chapel, for the purpose of opposing the Mnisterial scheme. The large Chapel was completely filled, and presented an audience of upwards of two thousand five hundred persons. Sir C. E. Smith took the Chair, and was surrounded by a number of Ministers of all Denominations of Protestants, amongst whom we noticed the Revds. J. Cumming, D.D., A. S. Thelwall, C. Prest, J. Sherman, Morgan, Hunt, Scales, Archer, &c., Captain V. Harcourt, Messrs. Lord, Bartley, &c. The Meeting was opened with prayer, after which

The Chairman addressed the assemblage, and urged the extreme importance of the crisis.

Dr. Cumming, of the Scotch Church, moved the first Resolution, and entered into a very striking and interesting elucidation of the doctrines and morality inculcated in the Class Books and Standards of Maynooth. It was felt that nothing could have been more seasonable or important—had it been possible—than to have had this Statement repeated at every Meeting in the Kingdom.

The eloquent speaker denied that the present movement was, as has been asserted, a “ Voluntary ” movement, when such men as H. McNeile and Stowell were to be found amongst its participants.

The Rev. C. Prest (Wesleyan minister) seconded the Resolution.

The Resolution was then put, and carried almost unanimously, only two or three hands being held up against it.

The Rev. Dr. Archer next addressed the Meeting, in a forcible and impassioned speech, which was received throughout with tumultuous cheers.

“ Sir R. Peel thought to conciliate Ireland by this Grant ; Protestants of all Denominations appeared there to oppose the Grant, which Peel and Sheil, Gladstone and Bowring, were conspiring to carry. Mr. Macaulay had attacked the fanaticism of the ‘ sages of Exeter Hall ; ’ but who were they who carried by their energetic agitation the Slave Emancipation Act, but those ‘ sages ’ who, he had no doubt, were equal in wisdom to the sages of ‘ St. Stephen’s ? ’ ” (Hear.)

Captain F. Vernon Harcourt seconded the Resolution, which was carried *nem. con.*

The Rev. J. Lyon moved, and the Rev. W. Morgan seconded, the next Resolution :—

“ That this Meeting, cleaving to the Oath which Her Majesty took at her first appearance before her Parliament, that the Roman Catholic Religion is superstitious

and idolatrous, and believing that the measure, if carried, would offend the Majesty of Heaven, jeopardise the Protestant succession to the Throne, and bring the judgments of God on the Nation, determines, in His strength, and under a solemn responsibility to preserve unadulterated His holy Gospel, to use every constitutional means against so unhallowed and unprincipled a measure."

Thanks were voted to the Chairman, and the Meeting concluded by a Doxology.

The proceedings were, on the whole, very quiet, and, with one or two trifling exceptions, no interruption to the harmony of the Meeting was offered.

While such meetings were being held in various places, far too numerous to be here mentioned, the following Advertisement, in reference to them, was published by the Committee :—

#### "ENDOWMENT OF POPERY.

"The Central Committee, appointed at the Public Meeting, held on the 18th of March, for conducting the opposition to the Maynooth Endowment Bill, are rejoiced to find, that in every part of the Empire the public feeling is manifesting itself with a depth, and earnestness, and unanimity, which they believe to be wholly without precedent.

"The Committee still entertain the hope, that the Members of the House of Commons will not disregard the strong and unequivocal expression of the feelings of their constituents. Nevertheless, it is their duty to be prepared for the worst, and to contemplate the contingency, that the Bill may, for this Session at least, pass through Parliament.

"Now, as the Country has been fairly warned, that the present measure merely paves the way for an Endowment of the Romish priesthood in Ireland, it is abundantly clear, that so vast a question can never be regarded as settled, until it has been brought before the various constituencies of the Empire at a General Election. For that General Election, then, which cannot be far distant, the Committee will immediately begin to prepare. In the event of the passing of the present measure, they will endeavour to have a notice immediately given for its repeal at the opening of the next Session. In that Session, the Committee hope to be better prepared, by previous organization, to bring the feelings of the Country to bear upon the House of Commons. They trust to elicit a far larger number of Petitions; to find means for making the Members better aware of the repugnance felt to the measure by their constituents; and thus, in various ways, to arouse the Nation for one grand effort at the proper period.

"But for these operations it will be necessary that they should be provided with adequate funds. They are happy to acknowledge the receipt of many donations within the last few days; but, for the task which lies before them, a considerable sum of money will be requisite. They make this known without hesitation or reserve; and they have no doubt, that the zeal which is now kindled throughout the land will speedily supply them with the needful resources.

CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman.*

JAMES LORD, *Secretary.*

"London Coffee-house, Ludgate-hill, April 12, 1845."

At this period, a letter appeared from a different quarter, and taking, in some respects, grounds very different from those on which the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee were appealing to their fellow-Protestants ; but, in giving an historical sketch of this struggle, it would scarcely be doing justice to the noble Duke to suppress it,—as doubtless it served to stir up some to active opposition, who would not have been influenced by any appeal emanating from that Committee.

“ Clumber, April 13.

“ My dear Fellow-countrymen,—In the sincerity of my heart, and in anxiety which overwhelms me, may I address to you a few hurried lines, which are intended to exhort you to adopt the most decisive measures, ere the fit time for action be passed ? It is now late in the afternoon, and I only just looked cursorily over the contents of this day's post ; my observations, therefore, must be very brief indeed. I would have addressed you at an earlier period, had I not wished to see what course Mr. Gladstone would take. I still hoped, that he might be found true to the great cause of Protestantism, and that in him might be supplied another among the too few and able champions of the neglected and almost persecuted Established Church of England. Alas ! you have only to choose between submitting to be trampled upon, or making a loud demand by your public voice.

“ You must rouse yourselves as one man. Those who are attached to the Protestant faith—those who wish to preserve the predominance of the English Established Church as the protection and safeguard of these realms—those who will not submit to the imposition of the income tax, by which means a surplus is extracted from your pockets, that is to pay a sinful Endowment of a rebellious Popish seminary—Maynooth in Ireland—and this, too, when the smallest portion of a pound is denied to your own pure and truly Christian Church—look well into this perfidious proceeding ; see with your own eyes, judge with your own good understanding, act from the stoutness of your own noble British hearts. But be quick ! Lose not an instant ! Call County Meetings—require your Representatives to represent you in reality, and call upon them to support your Petitions. You are betrayed ; you are sacrificed in more instances than one ; you are the victims of some deep scheme which is not yet sufficiently developed ; but be beforehand with the schemers, although they may think themselves safe in their Parliamentary potency. If you hate and disapprove of this awful beginning of future awful intentions, speak out and act determinedly, and insist on attention being paid to your national feelings, to your love of God, and love of Country.

“ Petition ! petition ! Do this with zeal, peacefulness, and order, but with a perseverance and determination that nothing shall overcome. Do this, if it accords with your religious feelings and national sentiments ; if you do it, you may save our cherished land from the wrath of God and perfidy of man ; pause even, and the same rule which will revolutionise your Church, will doom your fields to lie uncultivated, your whole agricultural system to a ruthless destruction and starving desolation.

“ I pray you, my dear fellow-countrymen, to receive this brief and crude address, written on the instant, as a proof of my deep interest in our national welfare. I make this call upon your attention, that you may be forewarned of what may happen, not by a factious demagogue, but by an unflinching Conservative of all our most loved and approved national rights, privileges, laws, and valued institutions of Church and State.

“ Allow me to sign myself, &c.

“ NEWCASTLE.”



This letter, as a manifestation of decided Protestant opposition to the Grant, and coming from one who was entirely unconnected with their proceedings, was one of those efforts, "on entirely independent grounds," to which the Committee referred in their Circular of March 28th, and to which, in the catholic spirit which actuated them, they cordially wished God speed. There were other efforts, in a somewhat opposite direction, to which it will be necessary to advert hereafter, which were also "on entirely independent grounds," and to which, with equal cordiality, they wished God speed, so far as they could possibly tend to the end which they had in view. The letter of the Duke of Newcastle seemed to suggest the heading of the following advertisement, which the progress of the Debate in the House of Commons appeared to call for.

PETITION! PETITION! PETITION! AGAINST THE ENDOWMENT  
OF POPERY.

The Central Anti-Maynooth Committee earnestly invite the Protestants in every town and village of the United Kingdom to continue pouring in their Petitions on both Houses of Parliament, for the rejection of the Bill to endow the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth. There is still time to produce a mighty effect, even upon the House of Commons. Some weeks must elapse before the Bill can pass that House. In the mean time every day strengthens our hopes of ultimate success. The public feeling against the Bill, in all parts of the Country, is growing so rapidly, and becoming so fervent and determined, as to leave little or no doubt that Ministers must give way.

The constituencies are exerting themselves with effect upon their Representatives.

The Committee are fully prepared for the Second Reading of the Bill being carried, though by a smaller majority; but they confidently hope it will be rejected on the Third Reading.

The Committee summon the Protestants of the Empire to UNION, to unwearied EXERTION, and to continued PRAYER for the Divine blessing on this sacred agitation.

CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman.*

JAMES LORD, *Secretary.*

Central Anti-Maynooth Committee,  
London Coffee-house, Ludgate-hill, April 17, 1845.

On the same day, there appeared, in the Times Newspaper, the following Article on the proposed Grant to Maynooth, extracted from the *Journal des Débats* of Monday, April 14th,—which is, in every respect, so remarkable, that it is worthy of preservation among the documents relating to this eventful period. The interest manifested by Foreign Roman Catholics in this struggle,—the clear views of the true nature of the measure which are expressed, of the state of parties in regard to it, and of the position of Sir Robert Peel,—together with the ability with which the whole of it is written, all combine to make it worthy of a place in this Historical Sketch.

"Notwithstanding the apparent facility with which the Grant to the Catholic Seminary of Maynooth has passed the First Reading in the House of Commons, it would be a serious error to believe, that the Protestant people of England will endure, with resignation and with patience, this new attack upon their Church. We are therefore much mistaken, or the head of the British Cabinet will reap, before long, the fruit of the whirlwind which he is at present sowing. Sir Robert Peel is possessed of too much judgment, too much perspicacity, and too much experience of public men, not to have foreseen the profound modifications which this Act is destined to introduce into the general policy of his Country, as well as into the composition of his party. It may, therefore, be considered, that he is determined to risk all; and that he has already sacrificed that Majority, which he expended ten years in consolidating—ten years of indefatigable patience, perseverance, and address.

*"The measure which he has lately introduced to Parliament is neither more nor less than a revolution in the policy pursued by England since the Reformation. It is the GREATEST CONCESSION YET MADE BY PROTESTANTISM, without excepting the Emancipation Act of 1829.*

"The policy of England towards Ireland during three hundred years had but one object—that of extinguishing Catholicity. But the National Religion continued to fortify itself during those secular contests. This vivacious plant of the green Erin, sometimes bending under the storm, but always rising and increasing in strength under a shower of blood and tears, has triumphed over every attack. Perceiving, therefore, that they could not vanquish this passive resistance, which constitutes the strength of the feeble, the Statesmen of England concluded by abandoning the contest. In 1829 they made a great concession; but, whilst they admitted Catholics amongst them, they reserved to themselves the power of combating and prevailing over them by influence and by numbers. They were ever considered as enemies; or, at least, the Catholic did not exist in the eye of the Law. His Church was considered a mythology. His bishops and priests possessed not even the right to assume their titles.

*"But at present the Protestant State publicly acknowledges the Catholic Church, addresses its dignitaries by their titles, and, as a last measure, has consented to support its clergy. Not only does the Reformed Government of England renounce a useless contest against Catholicity, but it becomes the ally and the protector of that religion which it had persecuted and oppressed during three centuries; for the Endowment of the Seminary of Maynooth is but a first step in a new course, and leads forcibly to the general and regular Maintenance of the Catholic Clergy by the State. If the Government educates the Catholic priests, it will not be, apparently, for the purpose of suffering them to die of hunger, or to create a mass of useless and consequently a dangerous mass of capacities. The Protestants are not deceived by this Grant. They even consider, and with certain reasons, that it would have been more rational on the part of the Government, to pay stipends to the existing priests, than to take the pains to create and educate more, and THUS ESTABLISH A ROMAN PROPAGANDA. The Endowment of the Seminary at Maynooth, will lead necessarily, within a certain period, to that of the entire Catholic Clergy.*

"We were ever convinced that such would be the result, but we are equally confident, that it will not be effected, without the most determined efforts being made in opposition by the English Protestants. The Government will find itself taken between two fires. On one side will be placed, the partisans of the Established Church, and of the Union between Church and State. Those who maintain the principle, that the State ought to possess a conscience like a private individual, will

say, with Sir Robert Inglis, that the British Institutions are based upon Protestantism; that it is an offence against God and against men to encourage the propagation of error and of idolatry,—that it is to betray the Constitution and to give strength to the enemy. On the other hand will come the Dissenters, particularly the Wesleyans, who form the best organised body in Great Britain. It was they who, in 1842, defeated, by their Petitions, the Factory Bill, in which they discovered an interference of the State with public education.

“Nevertheless, we believe that Sir Robert Peel will, on this occasion, triumph over the united opposition. He is still too indispensable not to be master of his position. He alone is possible. Were he to quit the Ministry to-day, he would return to power to-morrow, borne on the arms of necessity. The Whig party does not constitute even a compact minority,—it is a mere cipher. The Tory party, at the last Election, became incarnate in the person of Sir Robert Peel, then enveloped in mystery. They abandoned themselves, body and soul, to the political magician; and now in vain endeavour to break a compact, which they detest, but which they endure. The Tory party sees each of its principles, each of its interests, each of its traditions abandoned in succession to its hereditary enemies. It is in vain that it resists; the master which it has adopted carries it with him through the current. This man has absorbed all in one word—*myself*. If the Duke of Wellington were disengaged, how would the Tories rally round him! If even Lord Stanley, that proud and fiery champion of the Church, had his hands free! But, alas! the old Duke has ‘yielded to the toga’—he has abdicated into the hands of a more skilful and more eloquent politician; whilst, at his side, the impetuous champion of Protestantism allows the flame of that eloquence, which had so often animated the House of Commons, to be stifled under the cloak of the Peerage. Oh! the great tactician—the consummate politician—had anticipated every contingency. He took care to annul or to neutralise beforehand every force which might constitute a centre of attraction beyond his sphere. *For these reasons he will again triumph.*

“But it is not with impunity that a Minister triumphs at the expense of his Party. Parties, like individuals, may sometimes submit to an humiliation; but they neither pardon nor forget. During four years, since they restored Sir R. Peel to office, the Tories have advanced from deception to deception. Every time that they wished to resist, their leader compelled them to bend under his inflexible authority; and their futile attempts at revolt, have only exposed their impotency, and his omnipotence, to all eyes. But it is an inefficient union which is founded on necessity alone. Sir Robert Peel, however, appears to seek no other connexion between himself and his Party but that of fear: it may be said, that he disdains those sympathetic instincts which form a more solid foundation for an alliance than mere force. He affects to make a parade of his power, and to drag after him his refractory Majority, according to the manner of the ancients. But, in the mean time, the gall is accumulating in their ulcerated hearts; and, publicly compared to those sagacious dogs who perform evolutions under the fear of their master’s whip, the Tories impatiently wait the day when they may throw off their chains.

“It is not *we* who wish to blame what Sir R. Peel is at present accomplishing. On the contrary, the measures which he proposes are conformable to the principles which we have ever maintained: but we consider his position in a Parliamentary point of view. It is only by means of Parties that Government is conducted; and Sir Robert Peel is, at this moment, striking the most violent blow at his Party which it ever received. We have often observed, that two united forces have elevated Sir Robert Peel to power—the agricultural interest, and the Protestant sentiment.

Well! of those two forces, one alone at present supports him. The agricultural interest, notwithstanding the radical reforms which he has introduced into the tariffs, sees still in him, the man who preserves it from the absolute liberty of commerce, and the breakwater which opposes the overthrow of the last prohibitive barriers. But *let Sir Robert Peel not imagine that he can manage the Protestant feeling so easily.* Whatever may be said respecting England, we shall never cease to render that Country justice. When her religious principles, or even her prejudices, are at stake, she sacrifices her interest without hesitation. Sir Robert Peel might revolutionise the laws which protected the great proprietors and farmers, without any injury to his influence; but at present *he places a sacrilegious hand on the religious Constitution of England, and he will see the consequences; and let him be assured that he will pay the penalty.* The old Protestant leaven still ferments in the hearts of the English people. It was, perhaps, considered extinct, but it only slumbered. *Before many days we shall find that it is awake."*

In reading the above Extract, it should be kept in mind, that the *Journal des Débats* is the known organ of the Roman Catholic Government of France. And it cannot but be interesting to British Protestants, to know what foreigners and Roman Catholics think of their position, and of the struggle in which they have been engaged; and what *they* expected to be the feelings and the conduct of the Protestants of this Country, at such a crisis. Ought not our *future* course to be such, as to justify the high opinion, which even our enemies have formed and expressed, of the depth of our religious feelings, and the strength and stedfastness of our Protestant Principles?

Nor can it be doubted, that the eyes of *Protestant Europe* were upon us, as well as those of *the Romanist Party* in France. The contest was felt to be one, in which the interests of Protestantism throughout the World were at stake; for, if Protestant Britain became the friend and ally—the supporter and propagator of Romanism, the great bulwark of the Protestant cause, which God in His wonderful Providence had raised up at the period of the glorious and blessed Reformation, must be considered as removed. And where *then*, could oppressed and persecuted Protestants, in any portion of Europe, or of the World, look for protection and support?

The interests of all Protestant Institutions were indeed at stake. Bible Societies, Missionary Societies, Tract Societies,—all who, in various ways, were engaged and interested in endeavours to promote and make known “the glorious Gospel of the blessed God,” were interested in this struggle; and they must still be interested in the results of that great Protestant movement, which the proposal of the Government excited and called forth, in opposition to the Endowment of a Romish Propaganda in Ireland.

But to return to the narrative of events. Petitions were still pouring into the House of Commons; and other means of influencing the

Members of that House, were not neglected. The importance of bringing the conscientious convictions of Protestant Electors to bear upon their Representatives *individually*, had been deeply felt, and strongly urged. As exemplifying the manner in which such attempts were made, it may not be unsuitable to insert here a notice, which was printed and circulated in the Metropolis about this period:—

“The following Declaration, addressed to Messrs. Lyall, Masterman, and Pattison, is lying for signature at the London Coffee House, Ludgate-hill; at Mr. Suter’s, No. 19, Cheapside; and at Messrs. Jackson and Walford’s, St. Paul’s Churchyard.

“Protestant Electors of London are earnestly entreated to sign it without delay.

“The undersigned Electors of the City of London are desirous of making known to their Representatives in Parliament, the deep repugnance they feel to the measure recently proposed by Her Majesty’s Government, for the Endowment of the Romish College of Maynooth. And, finding that time will not permit the calling of a General Meeting of Electors before the Second Reading of the Bill, they take this method of earnestly entreating the Members for the City of London to oppose the said Measure in each of its future stages. They feel also, that they would be wanting in candour, if they did not add, that they shall find it extremely difficult, in any future Election, to give their support to any Candidate who has taken part in passing this most objectionable Bill.’

“Please to sign *three copies*.

“Also, at the same places, will be found the following, to be signed by Electors of the County of Middlesex:—

“We, the undersigned Electors of the County of Middlesex, beg to express to you our deep regret at the Measure now submitted to Parliament, for the permanent Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth.

“We disclaim all intention to fetter the liberty which our Representatives should use, in giving their votes upon this, as upon every other question. But, having observed, with much concern, the view which you have taken of the proposed measure on its first introduction, we feel unable to acquit ourselves to our own consciences, if we abstain from such a protest as shall clear ourselves of all participation in an act, which must, as we believe, implicate this Nation in the guilt of promoting a system, as contradictory to the Word of God as it is injurious to the interests of man.’”

To each of these Declarations several hundred signatures were affixed.

Similar measures were adopted in other places.

During this period, the Debate on the Second Reading of the Bill was still proceeding in the House of Commons; and, as it may be interesting to have a record of those who spoke for and against the Measure, a List is here inserted, in which those who opposed the Bill are distinguished by *italics*.

April 11th—

*J. C. Colquhoun*

*E. Grogan*

W. E. Gladstone

Earl of Arundel and Surrey

*B. D’Israeli*

J. A. Roebuck

*Lord Northland*

April 14th—

B. Hawes  
 Sir Thos. F. Fremantle  
*Rt. Hon. Fox Maule*  
 Lord Castlereagh  
 The O'Connor Don  
*A. Lefroy*  
 Colonel T. Wood  
 Sir C. Napier  
*A. Stafford O'Brien*  
 C. W. W. Wynn  
 Hon. W. F. Cowper  
*W. H. Gregory*  
 Rt. Hon. T. B. Macaulay  
*Rt. Hon. F. Shaw*  
 Hon. Sidney Herbert

April 15th—

*Major Beresford*  
 G. Byng  
*Colonel Vernèr*  
 Joseph Hume  
*C. N. Newdegate*  
 J. S. Pakington  
*P. M. Stewart*  
 Earl of Lincoln  
 Lord Worsley  
 Monckton Milnes  
 Mr. Sergeant Murphy  
*Sir John Hanmer, Bart.*

D. R. Ross  
 Montague Gore

April 16th—

*G. A. Hamilton*  
 Rt. Hon. E. Ellice  
*C. Goring*  
*Lord Ashley*  
 Rt. Hon. Henry Goulburn  
 Sir W. Clay  
*Lord Bernard*

Sir J. Easthope, Bart.  
 Lord Jocelyn  
*John Bright*  
 Lord J. Manners  
 Andrew Rutherford  
 Hon. G. Smythe  
 Thos. N. Redington

April 17th—

*C. L. Cumming Bruce*  
 Sir J. Grey, Bart.  
*Colonel Sibthorp*  
*W. S. Blackstone*  
 E. R. Rice  
*T. P. Plumptre*  
 J. S. Trelawney  
 Lord Courtenay  
 C. W. Martin  
 H. M. Tuite  
 R. S. Carew  
 Lord Leveson  
*R. Spooner*  
 Sir James Graham, Bart.  
*Donald Maclean*

April 18th—

*W. Sharman Crawford*  
 Lord Claude Hamilton  
*G. F. Muntz*  
 Ralph Neville  
 R. M. Bellew  
*Capt. Taylor*  
 Sir F. W. Trench  
 Richard Cobden  
*W. B. Ferrand*  
 R. Lalor Sheil  
*Hon. C. E. Law*  
*T. Slingsby Duncombe*  
 Lord John Russell  
*Sir R. H. Inglis, Bart.*  
 Sir Robert Peel, Bart.

Of the last three Speeches on this important questions, it will be right to give a brief account.

Lord J. Russell said,

“ That he would have been content to give a silent vote in favour of this measure, had it not been for his regard to the Petitions of the People. He could not concur in the censure which Mr. Sheil had cast upon the petitioners of the Three Protestant Denominations, for he recollected how deeply the Country was indebted to them in all its past struggles for civil and religious liberty. They had taken up the question of Church Endowments very strongly, and were animated by warm prejudices in

favour of the Protestant, and against the Roman Catholic Religion; but he expected that, on further consideration they would see, that it was necessary that the House should proceed, in some shape or other, to remedy the grievances of Ireland. He defended the Roman Catholic Church from the charges of Idolatry and un-Christianity,—showed that the Bishops of the English Church in 1829 had admitted it to be part of the Universal Church of Christendom; and proved, on the authority of our first Prelates, that the Church of England must trace its own authority to its existence. Though the feelings which dictated these declarations had come down to the petitioners, he could not, on that account, yield to their prayers on this occasion. We had engaged, at the time of the Union, to treat Ireland on terms of perfect equality; and we had, therefore, no right to say, that we considered our Religion so exclusively true, that we would show no favour to the Religion of the people of that Country. If we said that, we ought to say to Ireland, ‘We give you back your compact; act upon this subject, as you think your own interest and your own duty requires.’ *He did not consider this as a question of pecuniary amount, but as one involving a great principle.* The Petition of his constituents should not prevent him from giving a vote in favour of this measure. He might be deserted by the Protestant Dissenters, for not supporting them in their prayers to throw it out; but, as his course in public life had never been guided exclusively by a wish to obtain public favour, he should not repine at it. The only course which could make a public life tolerable was, to act as you thought best for the Country, and take the chance of favour or disfavour, as it might betide. His belief was, that this measure would be received favourably in Ireland. *He would not accept it as the last of a series; for he maintained that, with respect to the civil and religious privileges of the inhabitants of that Country, the House had much to do—much more than had been stated by Sir J. Graham, in his admirable speech of last night. A large Church Endowment, for a small minority of its people, was a subject which Parliament must speedily consider;* and, either by supporting the Motions of others, or by bringing forward some Motion of his own on that subject, he would attempt to gain, for the people of Ireland, that modification of that Endowment which justice required. After showing how every Administration had been rent to pieces by these Irish questions, from the time of Mr. Pitt’s Ministry in 1800 down to the present day, he proceeded to show, how immeasurably the strength of the Empire would be increased, if we could come at last to some settlement of them. Had the Petitioners considered the dangerous consequences to the Country, of those successive breakings up of every Administration in reference to this question? If they had not, let them permit him to use his own independent judgment on this measure, and to vote in favour of a Bill, which would heal the bleeding wounds of Ireland, and place Ireland in the state of the most improving, if not the most happy, portion of Her Majesty’s dominions.”

Sir R. H. Inglis, who had all along been the strenuous opponent of the Bill, on the high ground of Protestant principle, then rose, and, (in reply to what had fallen from the noble Lord,)

“Contended that there was scarcely a single allegation in the Petitions against this Bill, which was not to be found in the Articles and Homilies of the Church of England. He therefore thought, that the censure which Lord John Russell had cast upon them was scarcely justifiable. He called the attention of the House to this singular fact, *that every speaker on the opposite side had considered this measure, not as valuable in itself, but as valuable in being the precursor of other similar measures.* He took a rapid review of the observations of every Member of her Majesty’s Govern-

ment upon that point,—although some of them had turned away from it, as if they had seen a snake in the grass; and he inferred from that review, that all their vague and indefinite phraseology was rendered perfectly clear, by coming to the conclusion, that, not perhaps this year, nor the next, but four or five years hence, it was the determination of her Majesty's Government, to propose a State Endowment for the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland. Such a measure, according to a well-written article in the *Journal des Débats*, would be *the greatest revolution in the policy of England which had been made since the Reformation*. He fully concurred in that assertion, and so did the petitioners against this measure. He then respectfully asked Sir R. Peel to answer, before the close of this debate, whether this measure was intended as an end, or as a beginning? and whether for the education of 500 priests of Ireland, or for the Endowment of the whole Roman Catholic Church? He asked him further, whether, if such Endowment was not immediately within his contemplation, it was consistent with his principles, that a Roman Catholic Church should be endowed, as such, by a Protestant State? The House had been warned of the consequences of rejecting this measure; *let him warn it of the consequences of carrying it*. Already they had alienated from them the Protestant feeling of the Country; and, by so doing, had lost the power of governing it with effect. Let them beware lest, by losing the confidence of their subjects at home, they impaired the source of their strength abroad, and so sunk rapidly in the estimation of Foreign nations."

Sir Robert Peel then rose. It is not necessary to go into the whole of his speech: but both the commencement, and a passage towards the conclusion, were remarkable. The Right Hon. Baronet commenced by saying:

"Mr. Speaker, I am not about to review the course of this Debate. It has been protracted to a period unusually long; but, I think, not unnaturally or unreasonably protracted, considering the importance of the subject, and the excitement of public feeling connected with it. The course of the Debate has exhibited many honourable examples of men determined, at all hazards, to express their conscientious feelings upon this question. Many on this side of the House, who, approving generally of the policy and conduct of her Majesty's Government, yet conscientiously differing from them upon the proposal which they have made, have proved their determination to permit no political or party considerations to interfere with the honest expression of their opinion—whatever might be the consequences of their vote. I assure them that, however deeply I regret that difference of opinion, I honour them for their motives. On the other hand,—I speak not of one, but both sides of the House,—there have been examples, equally honourable, of men prepared to encounter any risk—to brave the disapprobation of their constituents, and to relinquish, perhaps for ever, their political station, because they believe this measure to be politic and just; and they will act upon their own sense of public duty, rather than defer to the sense of their constituents. I say, that such conduct is honourable, both to the supporters and opposers of this measure. I abstain from minuter reference to the series of arguments adduced in this Debate. Whatever feelings may have been occasionally excited in course of it are overpowered by, and merged in, one feeling of deep earnestness,—that you will not be party to the rejection of this measure. You may think, and perhaps not unjustly, that it would have been better that this measure should have proceeded from the constant and strenuous friends of the Roman



Catholics. You may think it right, that those who have proposed it should forfeit your confidence; and, upon that principle, inflict the penalty. Withdraw from us your confidence—punish the men: but do not disregard the consequences of rejecting this Measure after it has been introduced. My honourable and respected Friend, the Member for the University of Oxford, has told us, that we have forfeited the confidence, not only of a great Party in this House, but of a still greater Party out of it. He says, we have destroyed that element of power, which constitutes our ability to carry on the Government; and I have been told, in the course of to-night, that, if I were to appeal even to my own constituents, limited as is their number, and strongly as they are disposed to be my friends,—that if I depended on my personal confidence in them, I should forfeit my seat. Well, be it so. Suppose that that is a correct representation of affairs, do you believe, that we would have incurred those hazards—that we would have incurred the risk of forfeiting the confidence of this great Party—that we would have lost the confidence of the great body of the people out-of-doors—that we would have endangered our own existence as a Government, or our seats as Members of Parliament;—do you think that we, who have watched the course of events in Ireland, who have had the anxieties that accompany the administration of its affairs—do you believe, that anything but a sense of public duty would have induced us to incur that risk, which you tell us we have incurred?"

It may be well believed, that the Right Hon. Baronet made this appeal with much earnestness; and that he verily believed he was taking the only way,—so far as he could judge,—for preventing rebellion and civil war in Ireland; and that, not having faith in God, to enable him simply to do what was Scripturally right—right in the sight of God—and to leave the event to Him to whom events belong—he really did not know what else to do. But he might have remembered one striking fact in the history of Maynooth; that the College was founded in 1795, and in 1798 (within three years) the rebellion in Ireland broke out, and deluged that Country with blood!!

But Sir Robert Peel returned again to this sort of argument, and very pathetically appealed to the House, to have compassion *on the Bill*, whatever it might deem right to inflict upon *its proposers*.

"But I freely own that every feeling with regard to imputations of inconsistency, every feeling with regard to the security of the Government, every feeling is subordinate to one—*do not reject this measure*. I know not what the consequences may be, in respect to more kindly relations between Ireland and this Country. It has produced upon the minds of a generous people a kindly and grateful feeling. As I said before, punish us, visit us with censure, let the two Parties combine, upon the ground, that this policy ought to be carried out by those who were its original projectors; take what course you please: but *do not let your indignation fall upon the Measure; let it be confined to those who have proposed it.*"

The greater part of his speech appeared to be built on this kind of argument, *that principle had been violated* in various cases already, and *that* for a long series of years; and that, therefore, it was necessary—(there was no other resource)—to violate principle still more grossly and systematically!!

But a passage towards the very conclusion of this speech called forth much animadversion, when considered as proceeding from the Prime Minister of a mighty Empire :—

“ Sir, when I proposed this measure, I think it was on Thursday the 3rd of April, —I proposed it, having given notice of it at a former period, having given notice of it in the course of the last Session of Parliament, and without any the slightest reference to events which have since transpired; but on the day after I introduced the measure to the consideration of the House, our attention was called to a matter of great importance, and the Noble Lord (Lord J. Russell) felt it his duty partially to raise the veil which conceals the distant future. *There rises in the far western horizon a cloud, small indeed, but threatening future storms.* It became my duty on the part of the Government, on that day, in temperate but significant language, to depart so far from the caution which is usually observed by a Minister, as to declare publicly, that, while we were most anxious for the amicable adjustment of the differences—while we would leave nothing undone to effect that amicable adjustment, yet, if our rights were invaded, we were prepared and determined to maintain them. (Loud cheers.) *I own to you, that, when I was called upon to make that declaration, I did recollect, with satisfaction and consolation, that the day before I had sent a message of peace to Ireland.*”

When such language was permitted to fall from the lips of a Statesman, so cautious and reserved as Sir Robert Peel, it was justly considered, that the feelings of *the Advocate*, eloquently pleading for a favourite measure, had triumphed over the prudence and discretion of *the Prime Minister*.

While, however, these expressions were considered by some as strangely *incautious*;—on the question of *future Endowment*, the Right Hon. Baronet expressed himself with *his usual care and caution*; but with *such* caution as Protestants must consider to be singularly ominous. All his care was—not to throw any difficulty or embarrassment in the way of the future Endowment of the Romish Clergy in Ireland—whether by his own Government, or by some other. And, as bearing upon the importance of continued, and persevering, and united exertions on the part of all British Protestants, the following portion of his speech is perhaps far more important and worthy of note, than anything which has yet been cited :—

“ My honourable Friend (Sir R. H. Inglis) has asked me two questions. He called on me to state, whether or no this is a part of a preconcerted system, the whole of which we have not developed? and whether this proposal, in respect to Maynooth, is brought forward, for the purpose of facilitating hereafter the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Clergy? I will answer my honourable Friend explicitly. This proposal is brought forward simply and exclusively on its own abstract merits. This proposal is not part of a preconcerted scheme. It is not brought forward with a design of facilitating the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Clergy by the State. We have had no communication, on this subject of Endowment, with any authorities in Ireland or elsewhere. We have nothing on that subject in our contemplation.

I have seen remarks to the effect, that, though we have had no communication with Roman Catholic authorities in Ireland, yet that we have had some secret communication with higher powers at Rome. I state explicitly, that those reports are altogether without foundation. I entertain the strongest conviction, that we can do no good in Ireland by secret and unavowed negotiation with Rome, to which the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is not a party. I do not believe, that by such negotiation,—by fettering the independence of the Roman Catholic Church, or establishing any convention between the State and the Church of Rome as it exists in Ireland, of which the members of that Church were not cognisant, and to which they were not parties,—we should benefit that Country. I have said, that this is no part of a general system; I have said, that it is not brought forward designedly to facilitate some future proposal in respect to Endowment. I will say also, that, with reference to Endowment, there are very great objections. I have no reason whatever to believe, that there is on the part of the Roman Catholic laity, or the Roman Catholic Church in that Country, any inclination to depart from that public declaration which was recently made by the Hon. Member for Kildare, that the laity and clergy of the Roman Catholic Church were opposed to an Endowment. It is impossible not to see, from the demonstration of public feeling in this Country, that *here* also there would be great difficulty as to such Endowment. I have stated precisely the truth with regard to the question of Endowment. But my honourable Friend proceeds to ask, ‘Will you make a declaration, that it would not be consistent with your principles, that, at any future time, there should be an Endowment of Roman Catholic Ministers?’ I must say, I think my honourable Friend has no right to require such a declaration. I have stated most explicitly the truth: but this I will not do. Now draw no unfavourable inference from my refusal. This I will not do. *I will not hamper and embarrass any future Government, by a declaration now, that the difficulties are altogether insuperable.* I see great difficulties in the way of such a measure: but I do not think any one has a right to call upon me now, to give a public opinion, that those difficulties can never, at any future time, be overcome. *I do not think it would be fair, for the purpose of purchasing any relaxation of opposition to this Measure, for me to place on record a declaration of that kind,—fettering the actions of those who may hereafter be responsible.* My honourable Friend also asks, whether I do not consider, that there is some principle of Religious objection opposed to Endowment? In refusing to state that I think the objections at all times insuperable, I cannot say, that I think there is a decided Religious objection to such a measure. I do not think, with my honourable Friend, that the Religious objection is removed by the present Measure. I consider that this Measure has no bearing whatever upon the Religious question, whether Endowment be possible or not. *I believe that the Endowment Act of last Session,—by which you constituted a Board for facilitating the Endowment of Roman Catholic bishops and ministers, and for building Roman Catholic chapels,—had a much more material bearing upon the Religious principle, than the present Bill for a permanent Grant to Maynooth.”*

The Division followed immediately upon Sir Robert Peel’s speech; and, to the surprise and grief of all true Protestants, a larger Majority for the Bill appeared than had been at all anticipated,—the numbers being—

For the Second Reading . . . . .	323
Against it . . . . .	176
Majority . . . . .	147

The following List of the Division is taken, like the former, from the regular Parliamentary Document, which is always printed upon these occasions; and those who commonly vote *against* the present Government, are, as before, distinguished by an Asterisk; from which it will appear, that the Majority (including the Tellers) consisted of—

Conservatives . . . . . 161

Liberals . . . . . 164

While there are to be found in the Minority—

Conservatives . . . . . 148

Liberals . . . . . 30

And the Division, when thus examined, presents to view a strange breaking up of Parties. The number of Members absent on this Division amounted (vacancies included) to 152, of whom 86 are commonly considered as Liberals.

*Veneris, 18<sup>o</sup> die Aprilis, 1845.*

Maynooth College Bill,—Motion made, and Question proposed, “That the Bill be now read a second time:”—Amendment proposed, to leave out the word “now,” and at the end of the Question to add the words “upon this day six months:”—(*Mr. Colquhoun* :)—Question put, “That the word ‘now’ stand part of the Question:”—The House *divided*; Ayes 323, Noes 176.

#### AYES.

Acland, Sir Thomas Dyke (Devonsh.)

Acland, Thomas Dyke (Somersetsh.)

A'Court, Captain

Adare, Viscount

Adderley, Charles Bowyer

\*Aglionby, Henry A.

\*Ainsworth, Peter

\*Aldam, William

\*Anson, Hon. Colonel

Archbold, Robert

\*Armstrong, Sir Andrew

\*Arundel and Surrey, Earl of

Bagot, Hon. William

Baillie, Colonel (Honiton)

Baird, William

\*Barclay, David

\*Baring, Rt. Hon. F. T. (Portsmouth)

Baring, Thomas (Huntingdon)

Baring, Rt. Hon. W. B. (Thetford)

\*Barnard, Edward George

Barneby, John

Barrington, Viscount

Bell, Matthew (Northumberland)

\*Bell, John (Thirsk)

Bellew, Richard Montesquieu

Bentinck, Lord George

\*Berkeley, Hon. Craven (Cheltenham)

Blackburne, J. Ireland

\*Blake, Martin J. (Galway)

Bodkin, William Henry (Rochester)

Boldero, Henry George

Botfield, Beriah

\*Bowes, John

Bowles, Admiral

\*Bowring, Dr.

Bramston, Thomas William

Broadwood, Henry

\*Brotherton, Joseph

\*Browne, Hon. W. (Kerry County)

Brownrigg, J. Studholme

Bruce, Lord Ernest (Marlborough)

\*Bulkeley, Sir R. B. Williams

\*Buller, Charles (Liskeard)

\*Buller, Edward (Staffordshire)

\*Butler, Pierce Somerset

\*Byng, George (Middlesex)

- \*Byng, Rt. Hon. George Stevens  
Campbell, Sir Hugh (Berwickshire)  
Cardwell, Edward
- \*Carew, Hon. Robert S. (Waterford)  
Carew, Wm. Henry Pole (Cornwall)  
Carnegie, Hon. Captain  
Castlereagh, Viscount
- \*Cavendish, Hon. C. C. (Youghal)
- \*Cavendish, Hon. G. H. (Derbyshire)
- \*Chapman, Benjamin (West Meath)  
Charteris, Hon. Francis  
Chelsea, Viscount
- \*Childers, John Walbanke  
Cholmondeley, Hon. Hugh
- \*Clay, Sir William  
Clayton, Rice R.  
Clerk, Rt. Hon. Sir George  
Clifton, John Talbot  
Clive, Viscount  
Clive, Hon. Robert Henry (Salop)
- \*Cobden, Richard  
Cockburn, Rt. Hon. Sir George
- \*Colborne, Hon. W. N. Ridley
- \*Colebrooke, Sir Thomas Edward
- \*Collett, John (Athlone)
- \*Collins, William  
Coote, Sir Charles H.  
Corry, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Courtenay, Lord
- \*Cowper, Hon. W. F.
- \*Craig, William Gibson  
Cripps, William
- \*Currie, Raikes
- \*Dalmeny, Lord
- \*Dalrymple, Captain  
Damer, Hon. Colonel  
Dawson, Hon. Thomas V.
- \*Denison, William J. (Surrey)
- \*Denison, John Evelyn (Malton)
- \*Dennistoun, John
- \*D'Eyncourt, Rt. Hon. C. T.  
Dickinson, Francis Henry
- \*Divett, Edward  
Dodd, George  
Douglas, Sir Charles E. (Warw.)  
Douro, Marquis of  
Dowdeswell, William  
Drummond, Henry Home
- \*Duncan, Viscount
- \*Duncannon, Viscount  
Duncombe, Hon. A. (East Retford)
- \*Dundas, David (Sutherlandshire)
- \*East, James Buller
- \*Easthope, Sir John  
Eastnor, Viscount
- \*Ebrington, Viscount  
Egerton, Lord Francis
- \*Ellice, Rt. Hon. Edward (Coventry)
- \*Elphinstone, Howard  
Emlyn, Viscount  
Escott, Bickham
- \*Esmonde, Sir Thomas  
Estcourt, T. G. Bucknall
- \*Ferguson, Colonel (Kirkaldy)
- \*Ferguson, Sir Robert A. (Derry)  
Fitzmaurice, Hon. William  
Fitzroy, Hon. Henry
- \*Fitzwilliam, Hon. G. Wentworth
- \*Fleetwood, Sir Peter Hesketh  
Flower, Sir James  
Follett, Sir William Webb
- \*Forster, Matthew
- \*Fox, Charles Richard (Tower Ham.)  
Fremantle, Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas
- \*French, Fitzstephen  
Gaskell, James Milnes
- \*Gibson, Thomas Milner  
Gladstone, Rt. Hon. William E.  
Gladstone, Captain (Ipswich)  
Godson, Richard  
Gordon, Hon. Captain  
Gore, Montague (Barnstaple)
- \*Gore, Hon. Robert (New Ross)  
Goulburn, Rt. Hon. Henry  
Graham, Rt. Hon. Sir James  
Granby, Marquis of
- \*Granger, Thomas Colpitts  
Greene, Thomas
- \*Grey, Rt. Hon. Sir George
- \*Guest, Sir John  
Hale, Robert Blagden  
Halford, Sir Henry  
Hamilton, William J. (Newport)  
Hamilton, Lord Claud  
Harcourt, George Granville
- \*Hatton, Captain Villiers
- \*Hawes, Benjamin
- \*Hayter, William G.  
Heathcote, Sir William (Hampshire)

- Heneage, G. H. Walker (Devizes)  
 \*Heneage, Edward (Grimsby)  
 Herbert, Rt. Hon. Sidney  
 \*Heron, Sir Robert  
 Hervey, Lord Alfred  
 Hinde, John Hodgson  
 \*Hobhouse, Rt. Hon. Sir John Cam  
 Hogg, James Weir  
 \*Hollond, Robert  
 Holmes, Hon. W. A'Court  
 Hope, Hon. Charles (Linlithgowshire)  
 Hope, George William (Southampton)  
 \*Horsman, Edward  
 \*Howard, Hon. C. W. G. (Cumberland)  
 \*Howard, Hon. James K. (Malmesbury)  
 \*Howard, Hon. Edward G. G. (Morpeth)  
 \*Howard, Philip Henry (Carlisle)  
 \*Howard, Hon. Henry (Cricklade)  
 \*Howard, Sir Ralph (Wicklows.)  
 \*Howick, Viscount  
 \*Hume, Joseph  
 \*Hutt, William  
 Ingestre, Viscount  
 Irving, John  
 James, Sir Walter C. (Hull)  
 Jermyn, Earl  
 Jocelyn, Viscount  
 Johnstone, Sir John (Scarborough)  
 Kelly, Fitz Roy (Cambridge)  
 Knight, Henry Gally (Notts.)  
 \*Labouchere, Rt. Hon. Henry  
 \*Lambton, Hedworth  
 \*Langston, James Haughton  
 Lascelles, Hon. W. S.  
 \*Leader, John Temple  
 Legh, George Cornwall  
 \*Lemon, Sir Charles  
 Lennox, Lord Arthur  
 \*Leveson, Lord  
 Liddell, Hon. Henry Thomas  
 Lincoln, Earl of  
 Lindsay, Hugh Hamilton  
 \*Listowel, Earl of  
 \*Loch, James  
 Lyall, George  
 \*Macaulay, Rt. Hon. Thomas B.  
 Mackenzie, Wm. F. (Peebles)  
 Mackinnon, Wm. Alexander  
 \*Macnamara, Major  
 McGeachy, Forster Alleyne  
 McNeill, Duncan  
 Mahon, Viscount  
 \*Mangles, Ross Donnelly  
 Manners, Lord C. S. (Leicester)  
 Manners, Lord John (Newark)  
 March, Earl of  
 \*Marshall, William  
 \*Martin, John (Tewkesbury)  
 Martin, C. Wykeham (Newport)  
 \*Martin, Tho. B. (Galway Co.)  
 \*Matheson, James  
 Mildmay, Humphrey St. John  
 Milnes, Richard Monckton  
 \*Mitcalfe, Henry  
 \*Mitchell, Thomas Alexander  
 \*Murphy, Francis Stack  
 \*Murray, Alexander  
 \*Napier, Sir Charles  
 Neville, Ralph  
 Nicholl, Rt. Hon. John  
 Norreys, Lord  
 \*O'Connor Don  
 \*O'Ferrall, Richard More  
 \*Ord, William  
 Ossulston, Lord  
 Oswald, Alex. (Ayrshire)  
 \*Oswald, James (Glasgow)  
 Owen, Sir John  
 \*Paget, Colonel (Beaumaris)  
 Paget, Lord William (Andover)  
 \*Paget, Lord Alfred (Lichfield)  
 Pakington, John S.  
 \*Palmerston, Viscount  
 \*Parker, John  
 Patten, John Wilson  
 Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir Robert  
 Peel, Jonathan  
 \*Pendarves, Edward W. W.  
 Pennant, Hon. Col.  
 \*Philips, George R. (Poole)  
 \*Phillpotts, John  
 \*Pigot, Rt. Hon. David (Clonmel)  
 Pigot, Sir Robert (Bridgenorth)  
 \*Ponsonby, Hon. C. F. A. C.  
 Praed, William T.  
 Pusey, Philip  
 \*Rawdon, Colonel  
 \*Redington, Thomas N.  
 Reid, Sir John Rae  
 Repton, George William John

- \*Rice, Edward Royd
- \*Roebuck, John Arthur
- \*Ross, David Robert
- Round, John (Maldon)
- Rous, Hon. Captain
- \*Rumbold, Charles Edmond
- \*Russell, Lord John (London)
- \*Russell, Lord Edw. (Tavistock)
- Russell, Charles (Reading)
- Russell, J. D. Watts (Staff.)
- \*Rutherford, Andrew
- Sandon, Viscount
- \*Scott, Robert (Walsall)
- \*Scrope, George Poulett
- Seymour, Sir Hor. Beauchamp
- \*Sheil, Rt. Hon. Richard Lalor
- \*Shelburne, Earl of
- Sheppard, Thomas
- \*Sheridan, Richard Brinsley
- \*Smith, Benjamin (Norwich)
- \*Smith, John Abel (Chichester)
- Smith, Rt. Hon. T. B. Cusack (Ripon)
- Smythe, Hon. George (Canterbury)
- \*Somers, John Patrick
- Somerset, Lord Granville
- \*Somerville, Sir William M.
- Somes, Joseph
- Sotheron, Thomas H. S.
- \*Standish, Charles
- \*Stansfield, W. R. Crompton
- \*Stanton, William Henry
- \*Staunton, Sir George T.
- Stewart, John (Lymington)
- \*Stuart, W. Villiers (Waterford Co.)
- \*Stock, Mr. Serjeant
- \*Strutt, Edward
- Sutton, Hon. Henry M.
- \*Tancred, Henry William
- Tennent, James Emerson
- Thesiger, Sir Frederic
- \*Thornely, Thomas
- Tollemache, Hon. F. J. (Grantham)
- Tomline, George
- \*Towneley, John
- \*Traill, George
- \*Trelawny, John Salusbury
- Trench, Sir Frederick W.
- Trevor, Hon. G. Rice
- \*Tuite, Hugh Morgan
- \*Vane, Lord Harry
- Vernon, Granville Harcourt
- \*Villiers, Hon. Charles
- Villiers, Viscount
- \*Vivian, John Henry (Swansea)
- \*Walker, Richard
- \*Wall, Charles Baring
- Walsh, Sir John B.
- \*Warburton, Henry
- \*Ward, Henry George
- \*Watson, William Henry
- \*Wawn, John Twizell
- Wellesley, Lord Charles
- \*White, Samuel (Leitrim)
- Whitmore, Thomas Charlton
- \*Wilde, Sir Thomas
- \*Williams, William (Coventry)
- \*Wilshire, William
- \*Winnington, Sir Thomas E.
- Wodehouse, Edmond
- Wood, Colonel T. (Middlesex)
- \*Worsley, Lord
- Wortley, Hon. Jas. Stuart (Bute)
- Wortley, Hon. John Stuart (Yorkshire)
- \*Wrightson, William Battie
- Wynn, Rt. Hon. C. W. W. (Montg.)
- Wynn, Sir Watkin W. (Denbighshire)
- \*Wyse, Thomas
- \*Yorke, Henry Redhead (York)

Tellers for the Ayes, Mr. Young and Mr. Henry Baring.

#### NOES.

- Ackers, James
- Acton, Colonel
- Antrobus, Edmund
- Arbuthnott, Hon. Hugh
- Arkwright, George
- Astell, William
- Bagge, William
- Bailey, Joseph, Jun. (Hereford)
- Bankes, George
- Baskerville, Thomas B. M.
- Bateson, Thomas
- Beckett, William
- Beresford, Major
- Bernard, Viscount

- Blackstone, William Seymour  
 \*Blewitt, Reginald J.  
 \*Bouverie, Hon. Edw. Pleydell  
 \*Boyd, John  
   Bradshaw, James  
 \*Bright, John  
   Brisco, Musgrave  
   Broadley, Henry  
 \*Brocklehurst, John  
   Brooke, Sir Arthur B.  
   Bruce, C. L. Cumming (Elgin)  
   Bruen, Colonel  
   Bruges, W. H. Ludlow  
   Buck, Lewis W.  
   Buckley, Edmund  
   Buller, Sir John Yarde (Devonshire)  
   Burrell, Sir Charles M.  
   Burrughes, Henry N.  
   Campbell, John Hen. (Salisbury)  
   Chapman, Aaron (Whitby)  
   Chetwode, Sir John  
 \*Christie, William Dougal  
   Christopher, Robert Adam  
   Codrington, Sir William  
   Cole, Hon. Henry Arthur  
   Colville, Charles Robert  
   Compton, Henry Combe  
   Connolly, Colonel  
   Copeland, Mr. Alderman  
 \*Crawford, William Sharman  
 \*Curteis, Herbert Barrett  
   Darby, George  
   Dawnay, Hon. William Henry  
   Deedes, William  
   Denison, E. Beckett (Yorkshire)  
   Dick, Quintin  
   Disraeli, Benjamin  
   Douglas, Sir Howard (Liverpool)  
   Douglas, Jas. D. S. (Rochester)  
   Dugdale, William Stratford  
 \*Duke, Sir James  
 \*Duncan, George  
 \*Duncombe, Thomas S. (Finsbury)  
   Duncombe, Hon. O. (York, N. R.)  
   Du Pré, C. George  
   Eaton, Richard Jefferson  
   Egerton, Wm. Tatton  
   Egerton, Sir Philip  
   Entwisle, William  
 \*Ewart, William  
   Farnham, Edward Basil  
   Feilden, William (Blackburn)  
 \*Fielden, John (Oldham)  
   Fellowes, Edward  
   Ferrand, William Busfeild  
   Filmer, Sir Edmund  
 \*Fitzroy, Lord Charles  
   Ffolliott, John  
   Forbes, William  
   Forman, Thomas Seaton  
   Fox, Sackville Lane (Ipswich)  
   Fuller, Augustus Elliott  
 \*Gisborne, Thomas  
   Gore, W. Ormsby (Salop)  
   Gore, Wm. R. Ormsby (Sligo)  
   Goring, Charles  
   Greenall, Peter  
   Gregory, William Henry  
   Grimsditch, Thomas  
   Grogan, Edward  
 \*Hallyburton, Lord J. F. Gordon  
   Hamilton, J. Hans (Dublin Co.)  
   Hamilton, Geo. A. (Dublin Univ.)  
   Hampden, Renn  
   Hanmer, Sir John  
   Hardy, John  
   Harris, Hon. Captain  
 \*Hastie, Archibald  
   Hayes, Sir Edmund  
 \*Heathcoat, John (Tiverton)  
   Henley, Joseph Warner  
   Hepburn, Sir Thomas B.  
 \*Hindley, Charles  
   Hodgson, Fred. (Barnstaple)  
   Hornby, John  
   Hughes, William Bulkeley  
 \*Humphery, Mr. Alderman  
   Hussey, Ambrose (Salisbury)  
   Hussey, Thomas (Lyme Regis)  
   Inglis, Sir Robert Harry  
 \*Jervis, John  
   Johnstone, J. J. Hope (Dumfries-shire)  
   Jolliffe, Sir Wm. G. Hylton  
   Jones, Captain (Londonderry)  
   Kemble, Henry  
   Knight, Fred. Winn (Worcester)  
   Knightley, Sir Charles  
   Law, Hon. Charles Ewan  
   Lawson, Andrew  
   Lefroy, Anthony



- |                                    |                                    |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Leslie, Charles Powell             | Rendlesham, Lord                   |
| Long, Walter                       | Richards, Richard                  |
| Lowther, Sir John Henry (York)     | Rolleston, Colonel                 |
| Lowther, Hon. Col. (Westmoreland)  | Round, Charles Gray (Essex)        |
| Mackenzie, Thomas (Ross, &c.)      | Rushbrooke, Colonel                |
| Maclean, Donald                    | Ryder, Hon. Granville D.           |
| *McTaggart, Sir John               | Sanderson, Richard                 |
| Mainwaring, Townshend              | Shaw, Right Hon. Frederick         |
| Marton, George                     | Sibthorp, Colonel                  |
| Masterman, John                    | Smith, Abel (Herts)                |
| *Maule, Right Hon. Fox             | Smyth, Sir Henry (Colchester)      |
| Maunsell, Thomas Philip            | Smollett, Alexander                |
| Maxwell, Hon. James Pierce         | Spooner, Richard                   |
| *Morris, David                     | Stanley, Edward (Cumberland)       |
| Mundy, Edward Miller               | *Stewart, Patrick Max. (Renfrew)   |
| *Muntz, George Frederick           | Stuart, Henry (Bedford)            |
| Neeld, Joseph (Chippenham)         | *Talbot, Christopher R. M.         |
| Neeld, John (Cricklade)            | Taylor, Edward (Dublin Co.)        |
| Newdegate, Charles Newdigate       | Taylor, J. Arthur (Worcester)      |
| Newry, Viscount                    | Tollemache, John (Cheshire)        |
| Northland, Viscount                | Tower, Christopher                 |
| O'Brien, A. Stafford (Northampton) | *Troubridge, Sir Edw. Thomas       |
| Packe, Charles William             | *Turner, Edmund (Truro)            |
| Palmer, Robert (Berkshire)         | Turnor, Christopher (Lincolnshire) |
| *Pattison, James                   | Tyrell, Sir John Tyssen            |
| Plumptre, John Pemberton           | Verner, Colonel                    |
| Polhill, Frederick                 | Vyvyan, Sir Richard R. (Helston)   |
| Pollington, Viscount               | Waddington, Harry S.               |
| Powell, Colonel (Cardiganshire)    | *Wakley, Thomas                    |
| Pringle, Alexander                 | Welby, Glynne Earle                |
| *Protheroe, Edward                 | Wyndham, Colonel C.                |

Tellers for the Noes, Lord Ashley and Mr. Colquhoun.

Hereupon another Division followed, in reference to the next step in the progress of the Bill through the House.

Maynooth College,—Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House will, upon Monday next, resolve itself into a Committee, to consider of making provision out of the Consolidation Fund for the maintenance of the College of Maynooth" (Queen's *Recommendation* signified):—Question put:—The House *divided*; Ayes 61, Noes 25.

#### AYES.

- |                                      |                                  |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Acland, Sir Thos. Dyke (Devonshire)  | Bruce, Lord Ernest (Marlborough) |
| A'Court, Captain                     | Bruges, W. H. Ludlow             |
| Adderley, Charles Bowyer             | Cardwell, Edward                 |
| *Aldam, William                      | *Childers, John Walbanke         |
| *Archbold, Robert                    | Clayton, Rice R.                 |
| *Baring, Rt. Hon. F. T. (Portsmouth) | Clerk, Right Hon. Sir George     |
| Barrington, Viscount                 | *Collett, John (Athlone)         |
| Boldero, Henry George                | Corry, Right Hon. Henry          |
| *Brotherton, Joseph                  | *Craig, William Gibson           |

- |                                  |                                      |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Cripps, William                  | * Marshall, William                  |
| Darby, George                    | * Martin, John (Tewkesbury)          |
| Dickinson, Francis Henry         | Martin, C. Wykeham (Newport)         |
| Eastnor, Viscount                | * Murray, Alexander                  |
| Escott, Bickham                  | Nicholl, Right Hon. John             |
| Fitzmaurice, Hon. William        | * Parker, John                       |
| Fremantle, Right Hon. Sir Thomas | Peel, Right Hon. Sir Robert          |
| Gaskell, James Milnes            | * Pigot, Right Hon. David (Clonmel)  |
| * Gibson, Thomas Milner          | * Redington, Thomas N.               |
| Goulburn, Right Hon. Henry       | * Russell, Lord John (London)        |
| Graham, Right Hon. Sir James     | * Sheridan, Richard Brinsley         |
| Greene, Thomas                   | Smith, Rt. Hon. T. B. Cusack (Ripon) |
| Hamilton, Wm. J. (Newport)       | * Strutt, Edward                     |
| * Hawes, Benjamin                | Sutton, Hon. Henry M.                |
| Heneage, G. H. Walker (Devizes)  | * Warburton, Henry                   |
| Herbert, Right Hon. Sidney       | * Ward, Henry George                 |
| Hinde, John Hodgson              | * Wawn, John Twizell                 |
| Hope, Geo. Wm. (Southampton)     | Wellesley, Lord Charles              |
| Jermyn, Earl                     | Whitmore, Thomas Charlton            |
| * Labouchere, Right Hon. Henry   | * Worsley, Lord                      |
| Lincoln, Earl of                 | Wortley, Hon. Jas. Stuart (Bute)     |
| * Macnamara, Major               |                                      |

Tellers for the Ayes, Mr. Young and Lord Arthur Lennox.

#### NOES.

- |                                     |                                    |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Bagge, William                      | Maclean, Donald                    |
| Buller, Sir John Yarde (Devonshire) | * Maule, Right Hon. Fox            |
| Clive, Viscount                     | * Morris, David                    |
| Colville, Charles Robert            | * Muntz, George Frederick          |
| * Curteis, Herbert Barrett          | O'Brien, A. Stafford (Northampton) |
| * Duncan, George                    | Packe, Charles William             |
| Duncombe, Hon. O. (York, N. R.)     | Plumptre, John Pemberton           |
| Ferrand, William Busfield           | Shaw, Right Hon. Frederick         |
| Forbes, William                     | Sibthorp, Colonel                  |
| Hamilton, Geo. Alex. (Dublin Univ.) | Spooner, Richard                   |
| * Hastie, Archibald                 | Taylor, J. Arthur (Worcester)      |
| Henley, Joseph Warner               | Waddington, Harry S.               |
| * Hindley, Charles                  |                                    |

Tellers for the Noes, \*Mr. Thomas Duncombe and Sir Robert Harry Inglis.

The course of this Debate, and the disposition which was manifested to make light of the Petitions of the people, which poured in so abundantly into the House of Commons, made it manifest, that it was highly desirable to use other and extraordinary means, to give emphasis to those Petitions, and to manifest more strongly and decidedly the feeling of British Protestants in reference to the Maynooth Endowment Bill. Hence arose the first idea of that CONFERENCE, the full account of which it is the main desire of this volume to present to the British Public.

After much deliberation and earnest prayer, the following Resolution was passed by the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee :—

“ Wednesday, April 16th, 1845.

“ Resolved,—That it is highly desirable to summon Gentlemen from all parts of the Country, to hold a Public Meeting in London; and also, to give their personal assurance to the Government, and to their respective Representatives, as to the opinions and feelings of their Fellow-Countrymen on the Maynooth Endowment Bill; and that it be referred to the Executive Committee, to take measures for that purpose.”

The most active and energetic measures were therefore adopted without delay. The following address was drawn up, and put in type previously, and all arrangements were made, in order that, as soon as the result of the Division on the Second Reading was known,—it might be printed off, and sent to every Clergyman and Dissenting Minister throughout the kingdom :—

#### “ THE MAYNOOTH COLLEGE BILL.

“ Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, London Coffee House,  
Ludgate Hill, April 19th, 1845.

“ Fellow Countrymen!

“ The crisis is come! At three o'clock this morning the Maynooth Bill was read a second time by a majority of 323 to 176.

“ This we expected: and though it is a reproach and disgrace to this Protestant Country, that so many Members of the House of Commons should have affirmed its hateful principle, yet the means are still in your power to defeat it in Committee, and to secure its rejection when the Division is taken on the Third Reading.

“ To secure that consummation, earnest Protestants must do their duty; and we are happy to believe, that you are prepared to co-operate with us to the utmost, when the period for a combined and decided movement shall arrive.

“ We consider that this ought not to be postponed beyond the present month, and that on Wednesday, the 30th of April,\* there should assemble in London, Deputations from every town in the Three Kingdoms, for the following objects :—

“ First. Sir Robert Peel having intimated his opinion, that Petitions forwarded from the Country, at the instigation of your friends in London, are of comparatively little value,—we desire the presence of friends from each district of the kingdom, to vindicate their Petitions, and to assure the Prime Minister of England, that they but faintly express the unmitigated hostility of all classes of the community to his most offensive Measure.

“ Secondly. Such Deputations are highly desirable, that they may apply in person to their respective Representatives; for although those Gentlemen may have supported the *Second* Reading of the Bill, it does not follow that they are hopelessly committed to it. The representations of their friends may materially influence their future conduct.

“ Thirdly. It is proposed to meet in Conference, and to hold one or more great

---

\* The first Conference of the Deputations will be held at Ten o'clock in the Morning of the 30th of April. The place of meeting will be announced in the *Times* and *Morning Chronicle* of the 29th and 30th.

Public Meetings,—at which it is of the last importance that members of the Deputations should express the opinions of the Country on this momentous question.

“We are aware that such an assemblage can only be gathered at a sacrifice of labour, time, and money. But does not the occasion demand it? No subordinate considerations should be permitted to interfere with the high interests of that faith, which is dear to the hearts of all true Protestants; and the triumph of which was secured by the blood of our forefathers. We hope, therefore, that, on that occasion,—which will be ever memorable in the future history of our Religion,—no true-hearted community will be without its Deputation, to denounce this virtual abandonment of the Protestantism of our Country.

“But the urgency of the crisis will not permit inaction till then. We would, therefore, proceed with calmness, and as men of business, to show in what manner the interval may be most advantageously occupied.

“First. Although an extraordinary number of Petitions has been already presented to Parliament, yet there are, doubtless, very many congregations, parishes, and towns, throughout the Realm, that have not yet held public meetings on the question, nor even prepared Petitions against the Measure. Let them not imagine, that it is now too late to bestir themselves against it; the battle in the House of Commons will be, probably, protracted for a fortnight longer. There is, therefore, sufficient time for every Protestant in the kingdom to express his opinion, before the Third Reading can take place.

“Secondly. The full use has not yet, perhaps, been made of your influence with your Representatives. We observe that Petitions have been forwarded, by scores and hundreds, to certain faithful champions of our cause in the House of Commons. This is natural, but not politic. Petitions should, as a rule, invariably be sent to the Members of the Towns and Counties in which the petitioners reside,—though those Gentlemen may be known as supporters of the Bill. But this must not suffice. Protestants should now forget their politics for the sake of their Religion. We, therefore, entreat you individually to inform your Representatives, whether Whig or Conservative, of the intensity, and general prevalence amongst their constituents, of a conscientious feeling against the Endowment of Popery, and of the probable influence of that feeling upon the next General Election.

“Thirdly. We are happy to learn, that several of the ancient Corporations and modern Town Councils of the Kingdom have already moved on this subject. We regard the municipal bodies as appropriate organs for the expression of the opinions of the people; and we deem it advisable, that they should be convened for the consideration of the Bill for incorporating the College of Maynooth, and supporting it at the public expense.

“Fourthly. We strongly recommend, that all the Resolutions of Public Meetings on this subject should be liberally advertised in the newspapers, and that every use should be made of the provincial and *metropolitan* press.

“These are the proceedings which the present position of our affairs suggests. But we have other plans of constitutional and Christian opposition in reserve. We do not overlook the influence which the Addresses of the people may have, at the right moment, on the mind of our gracious Sovereign. It may become our duty to petition the Throne to dissolve the Parliament. In such a case, we hope to be prepared for the crisis. Give us, then, Brother Protestants, your confidence and co-operation, and, by the blessing of God, the triumph will yet be ours.

“Fellow-countrymen, though we have endeavoured to address you calmly, we confess that we are indignant at the combination of men of totally uncongenial

politics, to attack and undermine the Protestantism of this Country. Be it ours to form a counter-alliance, based upon the primary doctrines of the Reformation, and upon a mutual forbearance with regard to minor differences. When the advocates of Expediency combine, the friends of Principle should unite together, to resist a policy which is subversive alike of truth and justice.

"Remember that this is no common crisis. We are fighting anew the battle of the Reformation. Our Government seems to estimate but lightly all the blessings which were won by the labours, prayers, and sufferings of our ancestors. The eyes of Protestant Europe and America are upon us. What depression, yea, what dismay, will seize them, if they witness the triumph of Popery in the very fortress of Protestantism! Be it ours, then, in the spirit of charity towards our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, to unite together, with a generous and honourable respect for one another's opinions, political and ecclesiastical; and, by one great and holy confederation, to defeat this iniquitous measure, and so to uphold the honour of our Country and the pure Religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

"Signed, by order of the Executive Committee,

"CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman*.

"JAMES LORD, *Secretary*."

"Dear Sir,

"We beg leave to request your immediate attention to the proposals contained in the preceding address; and we trust a holy zeal for our common Protestantism will not permit you to leave any lawful means unemployed, to defeat the Maynooth Bill in Parliament.

"There is much reason to hope, that, by the blessing of Almighty God on the combined and persevering efforts of the people, and in answer to their united and fervent prayers, our wishes may yet be gratified in the triumph of our righteous cause.

"We shall be greatly obliged, if, at your earliest convenience, you will inform us, whether we may hope for a Deputation from the Protestants of your Town or County? or what other means are in progress, to bring electoral influence to bear upon your Members in Parliament?

"In order to facilitate the arrangements of the Conference, we request the favour of the following information being communicated to the Secretary, as many days as possible previous to the 30th of April:—

"The name of the Place, District, or Community by which Deputations will be sent.

"The full name and address of the gentlemen (ministers or others) who will constitute the Deputations.

"As we are maintaining this opposition at a great cost, not for the Metropolis only, but for the Empire, so permit us to add, that we shall be very grateful for the pecuniary assistance of our wealthy friends in every part of the kingdom.

"We have the honour to be, dear Sir,

"Yours truly,

"CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman*.

"JAMES LORD, *Secretary*."

By dint of great exertion, nearly 30,000 copies of this address were posted in the course of Saturday, April 19th, and Monday, April 21st; and immediately answers began to pour in—announcing that Deputa-

tions would come, in response to this invitation, from various parts of England and Wales, Scotland and Ireland. And the Executive Committee made every exertion in their power, to make all suitable arrangements for receiving them.

At the same time, in pursuance of a Resolution passed by the great Meeting at Covent Garden Theatre, the following Circular was issued to Clergymen and Ministers in London :—

“ CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE.

“ London Coffee House, Ludgate Hill, London,  
April 19th, 1845.

“ Dear Sir,

“ We are happy to inform you, that, in consequence of the Second Reading of the Maynooth Bill in the House of Commons, that Committee, pursuant to a Resolution passed at Covent Garden Theatre, have made arrangements to hold an Adjourned Aggregate Protestant Meeting at Exeter Hall, on Tuesday next, April 22nd, at half-past Six o'clock.

“ We respectfully invite your attendance, and shall feel obliged if you will cause notice of the Meeting to be given to your Congregation next Sunday.

“ Tickets may be obtained of Mr. Nisbet, Berners Street, Oxford Street; Seeley, Fleet Street; Messrs. Jackson and Walford, St. Paul's Churchyard; Mr. Dalton, Cockspur Street; Mr. Dinnis, Paternoster Row; Aylott and Jones, Paternoster Row; and at 11, Exeter Hall.

“ We remain, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

“ CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman*.

“ JAMES LORD, *Secretary*.”

The Meeting thus announced, was accordingly held, on Tuesday Evening, the 22nd, at Exeter Hall: the Most Noble the Marquis of Breadalbane in the Chair. The Rev. Dr. Holloway opened the Meeting with prayer.

It was then moved by the Rev. J. T. Robinson, Rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn; seconded by the Rev. A. Tidman, supported by the Rev. C. J. Goodhart, Minister of St. Mary's, Reading—

“ I. That this Meeting, re-assembled in conformity with its Resolution, adopted at an Aggregate Protestant Meeting, held in Covent Garden Theatre, on the 14th instant, to oppose the Maynooth College Endowment Bill, expresses its surprise and indignation, that, notwithstanding the unequivocal proofs which have been furnished by the Country of its conscientious and determined hostility to that Measure, the House of Commons should have read the Bill a second time; and thus have given its sanction to a course of Legislation, which proceeds on principles, and tends to results, that are entirely opposed both to the Word of God, and to the cause of Civil and Religious Freedom in these Realms.”

Moved by E. Baines, Jun. Esq., of Leeds; seconded by J. J. Cummins, Esq.—

“ II. That this Meeting, being strongly attached to the representative form of Government, as essential to free institutions, and the great safeguard to national interests, loudly and earnestly protests against the utter disregard hitherto shown by

the Lower House to the Petitions and remonstrances of all classes of the Protestant community; and, while it tenders its cordial thanks to those Honourable Gentlemen who voted in the Minority on Friday last, it entertains the hope, that many of those who supported the Second Reading of the Bill, will, in deference to the expressed convictions and wishes of the Country, pause in the course on which they have entered, and give to the Measure, in future, their strenuous opposition; a line of conduct which will enable them to render to their constituents such an account of the trust reposed in them, as will be satisfactory to the Country, and creditable to themselves."

Moved by the Rev. Thomas Mortimer, Minister of the Episcopal Chapel, Gray's Inn Lane; seconded by Sir Culling E. Smith, Bart.; supported by the Rev. W. Chalmers, of the Free Church of Scotland, and James Cook Evans, Esq.—

"III. That, while this Meeting is composed of individuals who differ conscientiously on the question of the State's right or duty to employ the national resources in the support of Religion,—it, with one heart and voice, condemns the Endowment of Popery, as a course at once involving guilt and peril; and it feels grateful to Almighty God, that, in this unanimous conviction, there is a basis broad enough for the combined action of all Protestant Christians, on which, notwithstanding the predictions and in disappointment of the hopes of opponents, they may energetically resist the present assault upon their common faith, and, by the blessing of Heaven, avert the danger threatened to their common interests."

Moved by the Rev. Dr. Bennet, Wesleyan Minister; seconded by the Rev. Jabez Burns, Baptist Minister—

"IV. That this Meeting approves of the course taken by the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, for assembling in London Protestant Deputations from all parts of the United Kingdom, to take steps, both for defeating this most objectionable Measure in the remaining stages of its progress through the Legislature, and for guarding against the recurrence of a similar outrage on their Religious convictions in the time to come; it calls on all the friends of the Protestant Faith, and of those principles of Civil and Religious Liberty that are based upon and owe so much to it, to co-operate in sending such Deputations to London on the 30th instant; and it trusts, that the proposed Conference, on the basis adverted to in the preceding Resolution, may be instrumental, under God, not only in preventing the National Endowment of Popery, but also in uniting more closely together the hearts and energies of all who hold 'the truth as it is in Jesus.'"

Moved by the Right Hon. Fox Maule, M.P.; seconded by J. D. Paul, Esq.—

"V. That the thanks of this Meeting be given to the Most Noble the Marquis of Breadalbane for his conduct in the Chair, and for the independent course his Lordship has pursued, and the sound principles on which he has acted in opposing this Measure."

The Marquis of Breadalbane briefly acknowledged the Vote of Thanks, after which the Meeting united in singing a Doxology, and then quietly dispersed.

The Great Room, Exeter Hall, was crowded in every part ; and, if it had been possible to have had Covent Garden Theatre again, there is every reason to believe, that it would have been as crowded as on the former occasion ; for, at this period, the excitement in the Metropolis, among all Classes and Denominations, was very great.

At this time also another event took place, which served very strongly to mark the depth and determination of Protestant feeling which existed in the Country. The Representation for West Kent had become vacant, in consequence of the death of the Earl of Romney, upon which event his eldest son, Viscount Marsham, M.P. for that division of the County, succeeded to the title, and thereby vacated his seat. Hereupon a requisition was sent to Lord Holmesdale, the most popular man in the County, which was quickly backed by 1,200 signatures, to come forward : but when questioned on the point, it appeared that he intended to vote for the Grant to Maynooth.

In a moment the whole scene changed. Mr. Frewen, of Sussex, a stranger in the County, consented to be put in nomination ; and a gentleman on the spot writes to a friend in Town, " It is my confident belief, that had he gone to the poll, we should have beaten him three to one ; so intense and ardent is the Protestant feeling in this division of the County."

Lord Holmesdale's supporters appear to have been of the same mind. They durst not go to the poll. Colonel Austin, another Conservative, having pledged himself to vote against the Grant to Maynooth and everything of a similar nature, Mr. Frewen was too glad to resign a post which a sense of duty alone disposed him to occupy ; and Colonel Austin, on April 25th, was returned on Anti-Maynooth and true Protestant principles, without opposition.

It was gratifying to learn, that Whigs as well as Conservatives allowed party politics to sink before this master question. They resolved to vote against Lord Holmesdale : they resolved to vote against every *Whig* Candidate who would not pledge himself against Maynooth. And they were ready to vote for Mr. Frewen, Colonel Austin, or any other fit Candidate, who would resist the Anti-Protestant action of the Cabinet.

The practical decision of the men of West Kent, on this important occasion, was in full accordance with the feeling evinced by the vast Meeting at Exeter Hall, on Tuesday evening : for, whenever any allusion was made, on that occasion, to " the reckoning which the present Representatives of the people would shortly have to enter upon with their constituents," the whole assembly rose, and responded to the sentiment suggested, with most enthusiastic cheering.

On Thursday another Division took place in the House of Commons, on a Motion, of which H. G. Ward, Esq., M.P. for Sheffield, had given



notice, to the effect, that "it is the opinion of this House, that any provision to be made for the purposes of the present Bill, ought to be taken from the funds already applicable to Ecclesiastical purposes in Ireland." This was a question on which the Anti-Maynooth Committee, in consistency with the principles on which it was formed, could not at all interfere; but, as the Division served to illustrate the state of Parties in the House of Commons, it may not be unsuitable to insert here (with some corrections) the Analysis of the Division, which appeared in the *Times* of April 26th. That paper says:

"Upon analysing the lists of the Division which took place on Thursday night, it appears that Sir R. Peel still retains amongst his supporters 24 Whig-Radicals, though, as might be expected, 298 Conservatives voted with him, which of course makes a total of 322 Members of the House of Commons who have recorded their votes to this effect; viz. that, since there must be a Grant to Maynooth, it ought to come out of the Consolidated Fund, and not be charged upon the property of the Church. On the other hand, 149 gentlemen have by their votes asserted, that the 'rents, issues, and profits' of the Church may be applied to educational purposes. The attendance of Members on Thursday was full, but not extremely numerous,—the total number of absentees being 175; of those, 70 profess Conservatism, while 105 assume to themselves the appellation of 'Liberals.' Upon referring to the Lists of the Division which took place on last Saturday morning, and contrasting them with the occurrences of Thursday night, it appears that 34 of the Conservative body were absent on Saturday morning, but, on Thursday, were, as the phrase is, 'whipped up,' in order to resist the proposition of Mr. Ward. Again, 17 Conservatives supported Sir Robert Peel's Measure; but took care not to be present, when the question of appropriating Irish Church property was to be decided. Next, we find 24 Conservatives likewise absenting themselves from this last Division, who yet opposed the Government Motion on Saturday; finally, there were 28 Conservatives wholly absent,—having attended neither the one Division nor the other.

"The following are the 24 Whig-Radicals who opposed Mr. Ward's Amendment on Thursday night:—

Ainsworth, Peter  
 Archbold, Robert  
 Arundel and Surrey, Earl of  
 Baring, Right Hon. F. T.  
 Barron, Sir H. W.  
 Browne, Hon. W.  
 Colebrooke, Sir T. E.  
 Cowper, Hon. W. F.  
 Ferguson, Sir R. A.

Heathcote, G. J.  
 Howard, P. H.  
 Lemon, Sir Charles  
 Listowell, Earl of  
 Martin, T. B.  
 Morris, David  
 Philipps, Sir R. B. P.  
 Rawdon, Colonel  
 Rumbold, C. E.

Shelburne, Earl of  
 Sheridan, R. B.  
 Standish, C.

Staunton, Sir G. T.  
 Winnington, Sir T. E.  
 Wrightson, W. B.

The following are the Conservatives who opposed Mr. Ward's Amendment :—

Ackers, James  
 Acland, Sir T. Dyke  
 Acland, T. Dyke  
 A'Court, Captain  
 Acton, Colonel  
 Adderley, C. B.  
 Alexander, Nathaniel  
 Alford, Viscount  
 Allix, J. P.  
 Arbuthnott, Hon. H.  
 Archdall, Captain Mervyn  
 Arkwright, G.  
 Ashley, Lord  
 Astell, W.  
 Bailey, Joseph  
 Bailey, Joseph, Jun.  
 Baillie, Colonel  
 Baillie, H. J.  
 Baird, W.  
 Baldwin, Barry  
 Bankes, G.  
 Baring, T.  
 Baring, Rt. Hon. W. B.  
 Barneby, J.  
 Barrington, Viscount  
 Bateson, T.  
 Beckett, W.  
 Bell, Matthew  
 Benbow, J.  
 Bentinck, Lord G.  
 Beresford, Major  
 Bernard, Viscount  
 Blackburne, J. Ireland  
 Blackstone, W. S.  
 Blakemore, Richard  
 Bodkin, W. H.  
 Boldero, H. G.  
 Borthwick, P.  
 Botfield, Beriah  
 Bowles, Admiral  
 Boyd, J.  
 Bradshaw, James  
 Bramston, T. W.  
 Brisco, Musgrave  
 Broadley, H.

Broadwood, H.  
 Brooke, Sir A. B.  
 Brownrigg, J. S.  
 Bruce, Lord Ernest  
 Bruce, C. L. Cumming  
 Bruen, Colonel  
 Bruges, W. H. L.  
 Buck, L. W.  
 Buckley, Edmund  
 Buller, Sir J. Yarde  
 Bunbury, T.  
 Burrell, Sir C. M.  
 Burroughes, H. N.  
 Cardwell, E.  
 Carew, W. H. P.  
 Carnegie, Hon. Captain  
 Castlereagh, Viscount  
 Chapman, Aaron  
 Charteris, Hon. F.  
 Chelsea, Viscount  
 Chetwode, Sir J.  
 Cholmondeley, Hon. Hugh  
 Christopher, R. A.  
 Chute, W. L. W.  
 Clayton, Rice R.  
 Clerk, Rt. Hon. Sir G.  
 Clifton, J. Talbot  
 Clive, Viscount  
 Cockburn, Rt. Hon. Sir G.  
 Codrington, Sir W.  
 Cole, Hon. H. A.  
 Collett, W. Rickford  
 Colquhoun, J. C.  
 Colville, C. R.  
 Compton, H. Combe  
 Conolly, Colonel  
 Coote, Sir C. H.  
 Copeland, Alderman  
 Corry, Rt. Hon. H.  
 Courtenay, Lord  
 Cresswell, Baker  
 Cripps, W.  
 Damer, Hon. Colonel  
 Darby, G.  
 Davies, D. A. S.

- Dawnay, Hon. W. H.  
 Deedes, W.  
 Denison, E. B.  
 Dick, Quintin  
 Dickinson, F. H.  
 Douglas, Sir Howard  
 Douglas, Sir C. E.  
 Douglas, James D. S.  
 Dowdeswell, W.  
 Drummond, H. Home  
 Dugdale, W. Stratford  
 Duncombe, Hon. O.  
 Du Pré, C. G.  
 East, James Buller  
 Eastnor, Viscount  
 Egerton, Sir Philip  
 Egerton, Lord Francis  
 Emlyn, Viscount  
 Entwistle, W.  
 Escott, Bickham  
 Estcourt, T. G. B.  
 Feilden, W.  
 Fellowes, E.  
 Ferrand, W. B.  
 Fitzmaurice, Hon. W.  
 Fitzroy, Hon. Henry  
 Flower, Sir James  
 Ffolliott, J.  
 Forbes, W.  
 Forman, T. S.  
 Fox, Sackville L.  
 Fremantle, Right Hon. Sir T.  
 Fuller, A. E.  
 Gaskell, James M.  
 Gladstone, Rt. Hon. William E.  
 Gladstone, Captain  
 Godson, Richard  
 Gordon, Hon. Captain  
 Gore, Montague  
 Gore, W. Ormsby  
 Gore, W. R. Ormsby  
 Goulburn, Rt. Hon. H.  
 Graham, Rt. Hon. Sir James  
 Granby, Marquis of  
 Greene, T.  
 Gregory, W. H.  
 Grimsditch, T.  
 Grimston, Viscount  
 Grogan, E.  
 Hale, R. Blagden  
 Halford, Sir H.  
 Hamilton, J. Hans  
 Hamilton, G. A.  
 Hamilton, W. J.  
 Hamilton, Lord Claud  
 Hampden, Renn  
 Hanmer, Sir J.  
 Harcourt, G. Granville  
 Harris, Hon. Captain  
 Hayes, Sir Edmund  
 Heathcote, Sir W.  
 Heneage, G. H. Walker  
 Henley, Joseph Warner  
 Henniker, Lord  
 Hepburn, Sir T. B.  
 Herbert, Right Hon. Sidney  
 Hervey, Lord Alfred  
 Hinde, J. H.  
 Hodgson, F.  
 Hogg, J. Weir  
 Holmes, Hon. W. A'Court  
 Hope, Hon. C.  
 Hope, Alexander  
 Hope, G. W.  
 Hornby, J.  
 Hotham, Lord  
 Hughes, W. B.  
 Hussey, Ambrose  
 Hussey, T.  
 Ingestre, Viscount  
 Inglis, Sir R. H.  
 Irton, Samuel  
 James, Sir Walter C.  
 Jermyn, Earl  
 Jocelyn, Viscount  
 Johnstone, Sir J.  
 Johnstone, Hope  
 Jolliffe, Sir W. G. Hylton  
 Jones, Captain  
 Kelly, Fitz Roy  
 Kemble, H.  
 Knight, H. Gally  
 Knightly, Sir C.  
 Law, Hon. C. Ewan  
 Lawson, Andrew  
 Lefroy, Anthony  
 Legh, G. Cornwall  
 Lennox, Lord A.  
 Leslie, C. P.  
 Liddell, Hon. H. T.

Lincoln, Earl of  
 Lockhart, W.  
 Lowther, Sir J. H.  
 Lyall, G.  
 Lygon, Hon. General  
 Mackenzie, T.  
 Mackinnon, W. A.  
 Maclean, Donald  
 M'Geachy, F. A.  
 M'Neill, Duncan  
 Mahon, Viscount  
 Mainwaring, Townshend  
 Manners, Lord C. S.  
 Manners, Lord John  
 March, Earl of  
 Martin, C. Wykeham  
 Marton, G.  
 Masterman, J.  
 Maunsell, T. P.  
 Maxwell, Hon. James Pierce  
 Meynell, Captain  
 Mildmay, Humphrey St. John  
 Milnes, R. Monckton  
 Mordaunt, Sir J.  
 Morgan, Octavius  
 Mundy, E. M.  
 Neeld, Joseph  
 Neeld, John  
 Neville, Ralph  
 Newdegate, C. N.  
 Newport, Viscount  
 Newry, Viscount  
 Nicholl, Rt. Hon. J.  
 Norreys, Lord  
 Northland, Viscount  
 O'Brien, A. Stafford  
 Ossulston, Lord  
 Oswald, Alexander  
 Owen, Sir J.  
 Packe, C. W.  
 Pakington, J. S.  
 Palmer, R.  
 Patten, J. Wilson  
 Peel, Rt. Hon. Sir R.  
 Peel, Jonathan  
 Pennant, Hon. Colonel  
 Pigot, Sir R.  
 Plumptre, J. P.  
 Polhill, F.  
 Powell, Colonel

Praed, W. T.  
 Pringle, A.  
 Pusey, P.  
 Reid, Sir J. Rae  
 Repton, G. W. J.  
 Richards, Richard  
 Rolleston, Colonel  
 Round, J.  
 Rous, Hon. Captain  
 Rushbrooke, Colonel  
 Russell, C.  
 Ryder, Hon. Granville D.  
 Sanderson, R.  
 Sandon, Viscount  
 Seymour, Sir Horace B.  
 Shirley, Evelyn J.  
 Shirley, E. P.  
 Sibthorp, Colonel  
 Smith, Abel  
 Smith, Rt. Hon. T. B. C.  
 Smythe, Hon. G.  
 Smollett, Alexander  
 Somerset, Lord Granville  
 Somerton, Viscount  
 Somes, Joseph  
 Sotheron, T. H. S.  
 Spooner, Richard  
 Stanley, E.  
 Stewart, J.  
 Stuart, H.  
 Sturt, H. C.  
 Sutton, Hon. H. M.  
 Taylor, E.  
 Taylor, J. A.  
 Tennent, James Emerson  
 Thesiger, Sir F.  
 Tollemache, J.  
 Tomline, G.  
 Tower, Christopher  
 Trench, Sir F. W.  
 Trevor, Hon. G. Rice  
 Trollope, Sir J.  
 Trotter, J.  
 Turnor, Christopher  
 Verner, Colonel  
 Vernon, Granville Harcourt  
 Villiers, Viscount  
 Vivian, J. Ennis  
 Wellesley, Lord C.  
 Whitmore, T. Charlton

Wodehouse, Edmond  
 Wood, Colonel  
 Wood, Colonel T.  
 Wortley, Hon. James Stuart

Wortley, Hon. John Stuart  
 Wyndham, Colonel C.  
 Wynn, Right Hon. C. W. W.  
 Yorke, Hon. Eliot T.

*Tellers*—Mr. Young and Mr. Henry Baring.

As might reasonably be expected, the supporters of Mr. Ward's Amendment were quite unmixed in their politics. They consisted of 149 Members of the "Liberal" party, whose names are as follow :—

Aglionby, H. A.  
 Aldham, W.  
 Anson, Hon. Colonel  
 Armstrong, Sir Andrew  
 Baine, Walter  
 Barclay, D.  
 Barnard, E. G.  
 Bell, J.  
 Berkeley, Hon. Craven  
 Berkeley, Hon. H. F.  
 Bernal, Ralph  
 Blake, Mark  
 Blake, Martin J.  
 Blewitt, Reginald J.  
 Bouverie, Hon. E. Pleydell  
 Bowes, John  
 Bowring, Dr.  
 Bright, J.  
 Brocklehurst, J.  
 Brotherton, Joseph  
 Bulkeley, Sir R. B. W.  
 Buller, Charles  
 Buller, Edward  
 Busfeild, W.  
 Byng, Right Hon. G. S.  
 Carew, Hon. R. S.  
 Cavendish, Hon. C. C.  
 Cavendish, Hon. G. H.  
 Chapman, Benjamin  
 Christie, W. Dougal  
 Clay, Sir W.  
 Cobden, Richard  
 Colborne, Hon. W. N. R.  
 Collett, J.  
 Collins, W.  
 Corbally, Matthew Elias  
 Craig, W. Gibson  
 Currie, Raikes  
 Curteis, Herbert Barrett  
 Dalmeny, Lord  
 Dalrymple, Captain

Dashwood, G. H.  
 Denison, W. J.  
 Denison, J. Evelyn  
 Dennistoun, J.  
 D'Eyncourt, Right Hon. C. T.  
 Duke, Sir James  
 Duncannon, Viscount  
 Dundas, Admiral  
 Dundas, D.  
 Easthope, Sir J.  
 Ebrington, Viscount  
 Ellice, Right Hon. E.  
 Ellis, Wynn  
 Elphinstone, Howard  
 Etwall, Ralph  
 Evans, W.  
 Ewart, W.  
 Fielden, John  
 Ferguson, Colonel  
 Fitzroy, Lord C.  
 Forster, Matthew  
 Gibson, T. Milner  
 Gore, Hon. R.  
 Granger, T. Colpitts  
 Grey, Right Hon. Sir G.  
 Grosvenor, Lord R.  
 Guest, Sir J.  
 Hall, Sir B.  
 Hallyburton, Lord J. F. Gordon  
 Hatton, Captain Villiers  
 Hawes, B.  
 Hayter, W. G.  
 Heathcoat, J.  
 Hindley, C.  
 Hobhouse, Right Hon. Sir J. C.  
 Hollond, R.  
 Horsman, E.  
 Howard, Hon. E. G. G.  
 Howick, Viscount  
 Hume, Joseph  
 Humphery, Alderman

Hutt, W.  
 James, W.  
 Labouchere, Right Hon. H.  
 Lambton, Hedworth  
 Langston, J. Haughton  
 Leveson, Lord  
 Macaulay, Right Hon. T. B.  
 Macnamara, Major  
 M<sup>c</sup>Taggart, Sir J.  
 Mangles, Ross Donnelly  
 Marjoribanks, Stewart  
 Marshall, W.  
 Marsland, H.  
 Martin, J.  
 Matheson, James  
 Mitcalfe, H.  
 Mitchell, T. A.  
 Morrison, James  
 Muntz, G. F.  
 Napier, Sir C.  
 O'Connell, M. J.  
 O'Ferrall, R. More  
 Ord, W.  
 Osborne, Ralph  
 Paget, Colonel  
 Palmerston, Viscount  
 Parker, J.  
 Pattison, James  
 Pechell, Captain  
 Philips, G. R.  
 Ponsonby, Hon. C. F. A. C.  
 Protheroe, E.  
 Pulsford, R.

Rice, E. Royd  
 Roche, Edmund B.  
 Roebuck, J. A.  
 Russell, Lord J.  
 Russell, Lord E.  
 Rutherford, Andrew  
 Scrope, G. Poulett  
 Smith, B.  
 Smith, Right Hon. R. Vernon  
 Stansfield, W. R. Crompton  
 Stuart, Lord James  
 Stuart, W. Villiers  
 Strickland, Sir G.  
 Strutt, E.  
 Tancred, H. W.  
 Thornely, T.  
 Traill, G.  
 Trelawney, J. Salusbury  
 Troubridge, Sir E. T.  
 Tufnell, H.  
 Tuite, Hugh Morgan  
 Villiers, Hon. C.  
 Warburton, H.  
 Watson, W. H.  
 Wawn, J. Twizell  
 White, S.  
 Wilde, Sir T.  
 Williams, W.  
 Wilshere, W.  
 Wood, C.  
 Worsley, Lord  
 Yorke, H. Redhead

*Tellers*—Mr. Ward and Captain Berkeley.

The Gentlemen absent from this Division slightly exceeded the number of those who were not present at the Division of Saturday morning ; but, on both occasions, the list of Whig-Radical absentees was the more numerous. The following is a list of the Conservatives who were absent from both Divisions, viz., that on Saturday morning and that on Thursday evening last :—

Attwood, Matthias  
 Attwood, J.  
 Balfour, James M.  
 Cartwright, W. Ralph  
 Cochrane, A. D. R. B. W.  
 Cooper, Hon. A. H. A.  
 Forester, Hon. G. C. W.  
 Gardner, J. Dunn  
 Glynne, Sir Stephen

Hamilton, C. J. Baillie  
 Hodgson, Richard  
 Houldsworth, T.  
 Kerrison, Sir E.  
 Kirk, P.  
 Lopes, Sir Ralph  
 Miles, P. W. S.  
 Miles, W.  
 Morgan, C. M. R.

Palmer, G.  
Price, R.  
Ramsay, W. Ramsay  
Rashleigh, W.  
Scott, Hon. F.

Spry, Sir S. T.  
Thompson, Mr. Alderman  
Thornhill, G.  
Vesey, Hon. T.  
Williams, T. Peers

The following 17 Conservatives supported Sir Robert Peel last Saturday morning, but absented themselves from this Division :—

Adare, Viscount  
Bagot, Hon. W.  
Campbell, Sir Hugh P.  
Clive, Hon. R. H.  
Dodd, G.  
Douro, Marquis of  
Duncombe, Hon. A.  
Follett, Sir W. W.  
Irving, J.

Lascelles, Hon. W. S. S.  
Lindsay, Hugh Hamilton  
Mackenzie, W. Forbes  
Russell, J. D. Watts  
Sheppard, T.  
Tollemache, Hon. F. J.  
Wall, C. B.  
Walsh, Sir J. B.

The following 23 Conservatives opposed Sir Robert Peel last Saturday morning, but absented themselves from this Division :—

Antrobus, Edmund  
Bagge, W.  
Baskerville, T. B. Mynors  
Campbell, J. H.  
Disraeli, B.  
Eaton, R. J.  
Egerton, W. Tatton  
Farnham, E. Basil  
Goring, C.  
Greenall, P.  
Hardy, J.  
Knight, F. Winn

Long, Walter  
Lowther, Hon. Colonel  
Pollington, Viscount  
Rendlesham, Lord  
Round, C. G.  
Shaw, Right Hon. F.  
Smyth, Sir G. H.  
Tyrell, Sir J. Tyssen  
Vyvyan, Sir R. R.  
Waddington, H. S.  
Welby, Glynne Earle

The following 34 Conservatives were absent from the Division last Saturday morning, but when the Grant had been agreed to, came up to vote against its forming a charge upon the Irish Church property :—

Alexander, N.  
Alford, Viscount  
Allix, J. P.  
Archdall, Captain M.  
Baillie, H. J.  
Baillie, Colonel  
Baldwin, B.  
Benbow, J.  
Blakemore, R.  
Bunbury, T.  
Chute, W. L. W.  
Collett, W. R.  
Cresswell, Baker

Davies, D. A. S.  
Grimston, Viscount  
Henniker, Lord  
Hope, Alexander  
Hotham, Lord  
Irton, S.  
Lockhart, W.  
Lygon, Hon. General  
Meynell, Captain  
Mordaunt, Sir J.  
Morgan, Octavius  
Newport, Viscount  
Shirley, E. J.

Shirley, E. P.  
Somerton, Viscount  
Sturt, H. C.  
Trollope, Sir J.

Trotter, J.  
Vivian, J. E.  
Wood, Colonel (Brecon)  
Yorke, Hon. E. T.

The following is a list of 105 Whig-Radicals who were absent from this Division :—

Acheson, Viscount  
Bellew, R. M.  
Berkeley, Hon. G. C. G. F.  
Blake, Sir Valentine  
Bodkin, J. J.  
Bridgeman, Hewitt  
Browne, R. Dillon  
Butler, Hon. Colonel  
Butler, Pierce Somerset  
Byng, G.  
Callaghan, Daniel  
Cayley, E. S.  
Childers, J. W.  
Clements, Viscount  
Clive, E. B.  
Crawford, W. S.  
Dawson, Hon. T. V.  
Divett, E.  
Drax, J. S. W. Erle  
Duff, James  
Duncan, G.  
Duncombe, T. S.  
Dundas, F.  
Dundas, Hon. J. C.  
Ellice, E., jun.  
Esmonde, Sir T.  
Fitzgerald, R. A.  
Fitzwilliam, Hon. G. W.  
Fleetwood, Sir P. Hesketh  
Fox, Colonel C. R.  
French, Fitzstephen  
Gill, T.  
Gisborne, T.  
Grattan, H.  
Greenaway, C.  
Hastie, Archibald  
Hay, Sir A. L.  
Heneage, E.  
Heron, Sir R.  
Hill, Lord Marcus  
Hoskins, Kedgwin  
Howard, Hon. C. W. G.  
Howard, Hon. H. T.

Howard, Hon. J. K.  
Howard, Lord  
Howard, Sir Ralph  
Hurst, R. H.  
Jervis, J.  
Johnson, General  
Kelly, James  
Langton, W. G.  
Layard, Captain  
Leader, J. T.  
Loch, James  
Maher, Nicholas  
Maule, Rt. Hon. Fox  
Morison, General  
Murphy, Serjeant  
Murray, A.  
Norreys, Sir C. D. O. J.  
O'Brien, Cornelius  
O'Brien, J.  
O'Brien, W. Smith  
O'Connell, D.  
O'Connell, J.  
O'Connell, Maurice  
O'Connor Don  
Ogle, S. C. H.  
Oswald, James  
Paget, Lord Alfred  
Paget, Lord W.  
Pendarves, E. W. W.  
Philips, Mark  
Phillpotts, J.  
Pigot, Rt. Hon. D. R.  
Plumridge, Captain  
Powell, Caleb  
Power, James  
Pryse, Pryse  
Ramsbottom, J.  
Redington, T. N.  
Ricardo, J. L.  
Scott, R.  
Seymour, Lord  
Sheil, Rt. Hon. R. L.  
Smith, J. Abel



Somers, J. P.  
 Somerville, Sir W. M.  
 Stanley, Hon. W. O.  
 Stanton, W. H.  
 Stewart, Patrick Maxwell  
 Stock, Serjeant  
 Talbot, Christopher R. M.  
 Towneley, J.  
 Turner, Edmund  
 Vane, Lord H. G.

Vivian, Hon. Captain  
 Vivian, J. H.  
 Wakley, T.  
 Walker, Richard  
 Wemyss, Captain  
 Westenra, Hon. Colonel J. C.  
 White, H.  
 Wood, B.  
 Wyse, T.

The following Whig-Radicals opposed the Grant to Maynooth, and absented themselves from the Division respecting the source from which the Grant was to be derived :--

Crawford, W. Sharman  
 Duncan, G.  
 Duncombe, T. S.  
 Gisborne, T.  
 Hastie, Archibald

Jervis, J.  
 Maule, Right Hon. Fox  
 Stewart, Patrick Maxwell  
 Turner, Edmund  
 Wakley, T.

It is not unworthy of notice that Mr. Hindley, who strenuously opposed the Grant to Maynooth, should have supported Mr. Ward's Amendment."

On Friday Evening, April 25th, a vast Meeting of the Wesleyans of London was held in the City-Road Chapel, the Rev. Jabez Bunting, D.D., President of the Conference, in the Chair—supported by almost all the Wesleyan Ministers in London. The following Resolutions were unanimously adopted.

Moved by the Rev. J. S. Stamp ; seconded by Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart.

"I. That this Meeting, composed of persons who venerate the Holy Scriptures as the only and sufficient Rule of faith and practice, is deeply and solemnly persuaded, that the distinctive doctrines, principles, and practices of the Church of Rome are, in many important particulars, directly opposed to the teaching of the Word of God;—as well as intolerant and persecuting in their tendencies ; and dangerous, wherever they obtain ascendancy and influence, to the well-being of society, and to the interests of civil and religious liberty ;—and it must, therefore, regard all *National* Endowment and support of Romanism as a National sin, against which it is bound in duty most earnestly to protest."

Moved by the Rev. John Alder ; seconded by John S. Elliott, Esq.

"II. That, although this Meeting is decidedly attached to the great principle of Religious Toleration and Freedom, and desirous that the full practical security and benefit of an application of that principle should continue to be enjoyed by their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, in reference to their religious worship and observances, it is, however, altogether averse to any National arrangement, such as that which is proposed in the Bill now under discussion in Parliament, which will not

merely *protect* Roman Catholics in the free and peaceable exercise of this common right, but will actually *support* and *maintain*, out of the Public Exchequer of the Empire, an Institution expressly and *exclusively* designed for the training up and sending forth of persons to teach and propagate a system, which, by a large majority of the people of the United Kingdom, is deemed to be essentially unscriptural and injurious: nor can this Meeting assent to the proposition, that, because Roman Catholics have been relieved by the Legislature from all *civil disabilities*, it follows, that they should also receive, *from the State, and at its expense*, pecuniary support for their *religious system*. And the Measure now proposed is, in the view of this Meeting, *additionally* objectionable, because it proposes that now, for the first time, the Grant to the College of Maynooth shall be taken from under the annual consideration and control of Parliament, and that the College itself shall be Incorporated and Perpetually Endowed by a Statute of the Realm, and thus henceforth recognized and maintained as one of our *National* Institutions."

Moved by Thomas Farmer, Esq. ; seconded by the Rev. Peter M'Owan.

"III. That this Meeting, as a portion of the Wesleyan-Methodist Connexion, which has, for nearly a century, annually expended a large sum of money in endeavouring to improve the religious and social state of all classes of the population of Ireland, entirely and indignantly denies the allegation, that, in opposing the present Bill for the establishment of a Seminary in which the worst forms of Popish error are taught, it is actuated by feelings of hostility or ill-will to the inhabitants of that part of the Empire. It is satisfied, and willing, to contribute to every measure of sound and Christian policy, for developing the resources, improving the commerce, advancing the prosperity, and securing the loyalty and tranquillity, of Ireland; and yields to none in honest desires to give and preserve to her equal rights and equal laws: but it most earnestly protests against any attempt to conciliate the Roman Catholics of Ireland, by such an outrage upon the religious principles and feelings of British Protestants as is now offered, by a Measure which, it believes, will never secure any of these desirable objects; but which will rather tend to perpetuate and aggravate the miseries of that Country, and will increase the perplexities, and endanger the tranquillity and integrity, of the United Kingdom;—and more especially, as there is every reason to believe, that the present is but one of a series of Measures of still more injurious and Anti-Protestant tendency."

Moved by the Rev. J. B. Bennet, D.D. ; seconded by John Vanner, Esq.

"IV. That this Meeting, admiring the principle of the Representative Constitution and Character of one branch of the Legislature, has witnessed, with great pain and disappointment, the practical disregard shown by Her Majesty's Government, and by a majority of all parties in the House of Commons, to the religious convictions of the Protestants of this kingdom, as generally expressed in very numerous Petitions against the proposed Measure. It entertains the hope, that every practicable and constitutional means will yet be resorted to, and reiterated, to prevent the passing of the Bill now before Parliament; and it most earnestly recommends, that all Wesleyans possessing the elective franchise, should, on this occasion, forego all merely party and political bias, and should unite with all of every religious community, like-minded, to further, in every legitimate way, the return of those Candidates, at the next Election, who, rising with the greatness of the crisis above a

time-serving expediency, shall be determined to support the integrity and perpetuity of our National Protestantism. This Meeting is also most desirous, for itself and for its friends, that this whole procedure should be conducted in the spirit of constant faith in God, and of unwearied and united prayer to Him who can alone rule the opinions, wills, and affections of men: protect the interests of His own essential and fundamental Truth; and, by every event, however untoward, promote the stability and extension of pure and undefiled Religion."

Moved by the Rev. John Beecham; seconded by the Rev. A. S. Thelwall.

"V. That, having heard of the proposed Conference of Deputations from various public bodies, and of others opposed to this Measure, to be held next week in this Metropolis, this Meeting strongly recommends that Deputations be appointed from each of the Eight London Circuits to attend such Conference, and to co-operate with that Assembly in further resisting the passing of the Bill into Law; and resolves, that from this Aggregate Meeting of the Wesleyans of London, a similar Deputation be appointed, to consist of the Rev. James Dixon, D.D., the Rev. John Scott, the Rev. J. S. Stamp, the Rev. C. Prest, Thomas Farmer, Esq., J. S. Elliott, Esq., and Dr. John B. Bennet."

Moved by the Rev. John Scott; seconded by the Rev. Charles Prest.

"VI. That the most cordial thanks of the Meeting be presented to the Rev. Dr. Bunting, for the kindness and cordiality with which he has presided over the business of this assembly."

It is due to the Wesleyan Body to preserve this authentic record of their views and feelings on this great occasion: for certainly no portion of the community laboured more constantly, zealously, or unitedly in opposition to the Bill. Nor would it be easy to name a Meeting, in which the whole question was more ably discussed,—or in which a more unanimous and enthusiastic feeling of opposition was evinced.

In addition to the numerous Meetings which were held in London and its immediate neighbourhood, and the numerous letters which were addressed to persons of all classes and Denominations, in different parts of the Country, the Executive Committee engaged several of their friends, to travel through different parts of the Country, in order to stimulate and *direct* the exertions which were making in opposition to the Bill, and to induce the friends of Protestantism to attend the proposed Conference. The Rev. A. Reed, D.D. had already taken a long journey for this purpose. The Rev. James Kelly, Rector of Killashee, in Ireland, was kind enough to travel into Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex. The Rev. W. Tyler, Independent Minister, of Church Street Chapel, Mile End, travelled through some of the Midland Counties; and the Rev. W. Arthur, of the Wesleyan Connexion, went into Devonshire and Cornwall, for the same purpose. These journeys were manifestly useful and

important. Though Protestants were everywhere already *willing* to act,—in many places, they knew not well what to do : they wanted information, counsel, and encouragement. And, but for the exertions of those friends, some might have been too tardy in their movements, and so the opportunity would have passed away before anything was done ; others might have given way to discouragement, and (thinking that all effort was vain, or not knowing what to do) might have made no attempt to express their repugnance to the Measure, however strong and decided their feelings of opposition might have been ; and their silence and inaction would doubtless have been misinterpreted, and misrepresented,—as if it had proceeded from indifference. It would be doing injustice to the friends of Protestantism in the Country, to say, that the Deputations from London were *necessary to awaken their opposition* to the Endowment of Maynooth. They *found* the feeling ; and they *counselled* and *encouraged* it. And such communications from their friends in the Metropolis were cordially welcomed, as decidedly *useful* to the Cause ; and they doubtless tended much to *direct* the exertions of Protestants, in various places, and to stimulate them to strenuous efforts ; and especially, to induce them to attend the proposed Conference.

While these exertions were made by the Anti-Maynooth Committee, others were not wanting, which originated in different quarters. It had been said in Parliament, that the Clergy of the Establishment were indifferent to the Bill ; and, there is reason to suspect, that every influence which could be exerted was used, in various directions, to keep them inactive and silent. Yet, in various cases, whole Archdeaconries, with one consent, had come forward to petition against the Bill ; and numerous Petitions from the Clergy, Churchwardens, and Inhabitants of whole Parishes, had been sent up to the House of Commons. But, from Towns, and populous places, many *general* Petitions had been presented,—in which it did not *appear* how far the Clergy had come forward to sign, or to promote them. A Meeting was, therefore, held in London, in which two excellent Noblemen took the lead, who had long distinguished themselves by their consistent and zealous support of the Protestant Cause ; and the following letter,—to which their signatures were attached, was issued,—addressed to the Ministers of the Church of England,—and calling upon *them* to take a more prominent part, in opposition to a Measure, so pregnant with mischief to the cause of true Religion in their Country.

“ Rev. Sir,—Permit us to address you, in the name, and on the behalf of a Meeting of members of the Church of England, held in London on this day, for the purpose of considering the requisite steps to be taken, for opposing the augmented, permanent, and unrestricted Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth ; and to request the favour of your active co-operation in resisting the Bill now before Parliament for that purpose.

"We venture to press upon you this claim for your exertions with great earnestness at the present crisis; because it has been erroneously stated more than once, in the course of the recent debates in the House of Commons, that the Church of England, as a body, looks without feelings of repugnance upon that Measure, which tends, in our opinion, to establish Popery in Ireland, and to destroy that portion of the United Church which is established in that Country, and to impair the security of all the ecclesiastical institutions of England and Wales, as well as of Ireland, and to inflict irreparable injury upon the cause of true Religion among us.

"We appeal to you also for your co-operation, upon another ground,—that of loyalty to the Throne and of attachment to the British Constitution, to which the Church of England has ever been eminent for her affection, and of which she has hitherto been the strongest bulwark; and we, therefore, earnestly entreat your speedy and strenuous aid in opposing a Bill, which encourages, endows, aggrandises, and perpetuates the unconstitutional and dangerous domination, in these Realms, of a foreign, hostile, spiritual power,—which is subversive of the just rights of the Crown, and incompatible with the Institutions of the Country, and which threatens to undermine the foundations of property, (especially ecclesiastical,) and is prejudicial to the peace, security, and liberties of our Protestant fellow-subjects.

"At a period, especially, when public measures appear to be powerfully influenced by external movements tending in a revolutionary direction, the necessity of energetic and well-organized action on the part of the Church, in matters of great national importance, and especially of religious concern, like the present, cannot be too strongly enforced, in order that she may maintain her legitimate position, and may continue to exercise that salutary influence, which her own office and the best interests of the community alike imperatively require.

"If, also, it should be possible hereafter for any one to allege, that on a question such as that now before us, of the most serious magnitude, and vital importance to the cause of true Religion, and to the Constitution of the Country—the Church of England had forbore to speak in a distinct and audible voice, and to act with that vigour, spirit, and unanimity, which her own character and the public welfare demanded; we cannot but anticipate the most disastrous consequences both to herself and to the community, through a diminution of the public confidence hitherto reposed in her, and by the forfeiture of that esteem and affection of the people which she now enjoys, and on the preservation of which, under Divine Providence, her efficiency, and even her existence, mainly depend.

"But we confidently believe, that it cannot be affirmed, with any show of probability, that the Church of England has been, is, or ever will be, indifferent to the maintenance of true Religion, and to the welfare of the Institutions of the Country; and we trust that the assertions recently made to the contrary, will find their speedy, full, and practical refutation, in Parliamentary Petitions against the Maynooth College Endowment Bill, signed by the inhabitants of every parish in the kingdom.

"We rejoice also to know, that an opportunity still remains to all ranks and orders among us, of showing, by parochial Petitions, (wherever such Petitions have not already been signed) that they are firmly united in the determination to uphold that form of religious doctrine and of civil polity, which they have inherited from their ancestors; and under which they have enjoyed the inestimable blessings of pure faith and of national prosperity, which they hope, with the Divine Blessing, to hand down unimpaired to future generations.

"We beg to subjoin a form of a Petition,—in which, with your approval, all your parishioners may concur; and to suggest, that it should be forwarded, without delay,

when signed, through your Diocesan, to the House of Lords, and through the Borough or County Members to the Commons.

“ We have the honour to be, Rev. Sir,

“ WINCHILSEA AND NOTTINGHAM,

“ KENYON.

“ (Signed on behalf of the Meeting.)

“ London, April 26.”

“ To the Lords Spiritual and Temporal (or, the Honourable the Commons) in Parliament assembled.

“ The humble Petition of the undersigned, the Rector, (or Vicar,) Churchwardens, and inhabitants of the Parish of \_\_\_\_\_ in the County of \_\_\_\_\_

“ Showeth,—That your Petitioners view with the greatest concern and apprehension the proposed Measure for the augmented, permanent, and unrestricted Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth.

“ That this Measure is virtually the Endowment and Establishment of Popery; that it is injurious to true Religion; subversive of the rights of the Crown, and of the principles of the British Constitution; and that it threatens to destroy the peace and liberties of the people.

“ Your Petitioners therefore most humbly pray your Lordships [or, Hon. House] that the said Bill may not pass into a Law.

“ And your Petitioners will ever pray, &c.

“ [Here follow the signatures.]

“ (N.B.—Petitions must be written on paper or parchment; and forwarded with the ends open, to the presenters of them, and with the words ‘ Parliamentary petition ’ written on the outside cover. No letter to be enclosed.)”

Nor was this the only effort made to combine the Clergy in strenuous and active opposition to the Bill. The Dignitaries of the Church were earnestly called upon to use their utmost influence in withstanding this unchristian and un-Protestant Measure. “ A Letter to the Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland on the proposed Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth, by a Master of Arts of the University of Cambridge ”—was published, which contained a very faithful and earnest appeal to those Prelates. An Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, of which the following is a copy, was drawn up and signed by seventy-nine of the London Clergy :

“ To his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan.

“ We the undersigned Rectors, Vicars, Curates, and others, the Clergy of the diocese of London, approach your Grace with every sentiment of respect for your Grace’s eminent station and personal character.

“ Being convinced, upon the grounds alike of Scripture and the Constitution of this Country, that the proposed Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth is wholly inconsistent with the safety of the Church, the peace and prosperity of the State, and with the vows which we severally took at our ordination, to support and hold fast the doctrines of Christianity, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures, we humbly

entreat your Grace, with the Archbishops and Bishops of this great Protestant Empire, to resist to the uttermost, by all lawful means, within and without the Legislature, a measure so dangerous to the spiritual and temporal prosperity of the realm."

A Meeting was subsequently held at the Rectory House, St. Andrew's, Holborn, consisting of a number of Clergymen, assembled from various parts of England, to consider the best means of organizing a general opposition on the part of the Clergy to the proposed Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth,—at which it was Moved by the Rev. Hugh Stowell, of Manchester ; and seconded by the Rev. W. Curling, of Southwark, and—

" Resolved unanimously,—That the Chairman be requested to communicate with Clergymen in all parts of the Country, respectfully urging them to promote, without delay, Addresses to their respective Right Reverend Diocesans, and also, through them, to his Grace the Primate, humbly entreating them, to oppose to the uttermost the proposed Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth."

It may, therefore, be truly affirmed, that, if any portion of the Protestant Community—whether Clergy or Laity—neglected their duty on this momentous occasion, it was not for want of earnest entreaty, or of plain and faithful warning. And, if any were disposed to disregard, or treat lightly, the appeals which proceeded from the Anti-Maynooth Committee—there was no want of appeals, equally faithful and zealous,—from quarters which were not liable to any such prejudice or objection as might have existed, in the minds of some, with regard to that body and its operations.

About this period, a remarkable document appeared, to which some reference was made, both in the House of Commons, and out of it. And, as it might have had some influence upon the conduct of Sir Robert Peel, in a matter which called for special notice in the proceedings of the Conference, (in which, also, there were some allusions to the document itself,) it may be well to insert it here.

At the orderly Half-yearly Meeting of the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, which took place on the 8th of April, Dr. Buchanan, in recommending the adoption of Petitions to both Houses of Parliament against the Maynooth College Bill, said—

" He held in his hand the memorandum of a remarkable statement, which he heard made, seven years ago, by the head of the present Government; that he did not consider that he violated any principles of propriety by reading it to the Synod. It was of so old a date as to be like express history; and besides, it was uttered in the presence of a Deputation from the Church of Scotland, who visited London in reference to Church Extension in 1838, and also before several Members of Parliament. He wrote the memorandum of it half an hour after hearing the statement, and while it was fresh upon his memory; and, in looking back at the

views therein expressed, and contrasting them with the proposal which now issued from the same eminent person—from Sir Robert Peel—may not one exclaim, ‘Trust not in princes, nor in the sons of men?’”

He then proceeded to read from his note-book :—

“‘Independent,’ said Sir R. Peel, on Saturday the 24th of March, 1838, ‘independence of thus rousing the English Members, and England generally, to the importance of the Church Extension question, he thought it was of the highest moment, that the English and Scotch Establishments should unite in these days, *on the common ground of the Protestant faith, in resisting the encroachments of the Church of Rome.* It is impossible, I think,’ (he said with great earnestness of tone and manner,) ‘to look at the progress Popery is now making, and the efforts it is putting forth, without anxiety and alarm. The Establishment of the order of the Jesuits in most of the Countries of Europe, the movements in Prussia and Belgium, the increase of Popish Chapels and Seminaries in our Country, show us too clearly what we have to dread; and I am persuaded (he continued) that *we shall ere long see a struggle arise, in which we shall have again to determine the question, whether Popery or Protestantism is to have the ascendancy.*’”

This statement of Sir Robert Peel, was very pointedly referred to by the Right Hon. Fox Maule, in the Debate in the House of Commons on the 28th of April : Sir Robert Peel was evidently very much annoyed by it; and it was supposed, by some, to have had its influence, in disposing him to refuse an interview with a Deputation from the Conference.\*

The few remaining days of April were fully occupied, on the part of the Executive Committee, with preparations for that Conference. Rooms were engaged at the Crown and Anchor Tavern. The plan of proceedings, on the part of the Committee, was arranged—subject to the approval of the Conference. Tickets were prepared, and arrangements made for issuing them to the various Deputies as they applied for them, according to lists which were made out, with much labour, from the letters daily received from various parts of the Country.

The following letter was addressed to all the Deputies :

“Central Anti-Maynooth Committee,

“London Coffee House, 26th April, 1845.

“My dear Sir,

“I am directed by the Committee to forward to you the accompanying Resolutions, and to direct your attention to them.

“I remain, sincerely yours,

(Signed)

“JAMES LORD,

“Secretary.

“The Executive Committee most earnestly invite the attention of all gentlemen who may be appointed as Deputations to the following Resolution, passed April 25th :—

---

\* See the Report of the Proceedings of the Conference, pages 5, 53—56.



"That an instruction be given to the Conference Committee, to print on the Agenda Paper for that body, the Resolution of the Meeting at Exeter Hall, on the 20th of March, which is the fundamental principle of our organization; and also to intimate, that it is expected, that no speaker will violate its spirit by the discussion of any extraneous topic."

The following is the Resolution referred to:—

"That, while this Committee is well aware, that the particular grounds on which different Bodies will found their Petitions against the proposed Grant to Maynooth, may occasionally exhibit, to a certain degree, the diversities of sentiment that prevail among them; they are nevertheless convinced that, in a cordial attachment to the principles of the Protestant Reformation, and a stedfast abhorrence of Popery, there is a solid ground for union and co-operation in opposing the proposed Measure; and they deem it of supreme importance, under present circumstances, to bear with one another in regard to minor differences, while they cordially unite in one great object."

The same Resolutions were also printed on the back of every ticket. It, therefore, appeared to the Committee, that all possible care had been taken, to explain to every one *the ground of Union* upon which the Conference was convened, and upon which all its discussions and operations were to be conducted. It is the more important to call attention to these circumstances, because, on the very eve of the Conference, a Deputation called upon the Committee; and a brief discussion actually took place, in the Second Sitting of the Conference, (as is faithfully recorded, pp. 40—43) from which it appeared, that the views and wishes of the Committee were not, on all hands, so clearly understood as they had confidently anticipated; and a disposition was manifested, to introduce topics of discussion, which,—in consistency with the broad Protestant ground of Union on which the Committee was formed, and had acted all along,—they could not but consider as irrelevant, and calculated to disturb the harmony which had so remarkably prevailed among them.

It was highly satisfactory to the Committee to find, that,—notwithstanding the brief discussion alluded to, and the consequent withdrawal of a few persons who had received tickets for the Conference,—the Members of the Conference *generally* went entirely with them; and the spirit of harmony and Christian love which prevailed in the Conference, from the beginning to the end, even exceeded their most sanguine anticipations—insomuch, that the Members of Committee, on meeting one with another, were led repeatedly to exclaim, "This is the Lord's doing; and it is marvellous in our eyes!"

With regard to the proceedings of the Conference—the full Report, which follows, will speak for itself. Perhaps that Report may be considered as *needlessly* full and exact; for,—with only the occasional filling up of a broken sentence, or a slight verbal alteration, for the sake of

perspicuity, and the retrenchment of mere repetitions,—the Editor has scrupulously adhered to the Report which was furnished by the shorthand writer. The only exception has been, that,—with the consent and authority of the Committee,—he has exercised his discretion, in omitting, or very much abridging, some discussions which arose respecting *mere verbal alterations* in the Resolutions, &c. Such discussions will naturally arise, more or less, when many persons meet together, whose habits of thinking, and expressing themselves, must be different,—and when there is, at the same time, a real desire to give satisfaction to all parties. But,—when this end has been gained, and all have acquiesced in the conclusion,—it would be altogether needless to be over minute in recording all that has passed in such discussions about words.

The Editor will only add, upon this point, that his anxiety to do full justice to all parties, by allowing them to speak for themselves, has been so great, that he believes himself to be much more liable to censure, for having done too little in the way of retrenchment and alteration, than for having done too much. And one reason which operated with him, was this : there was, to his mind, a conversational ease, and brotherly frankness, about the proceedings of the whole Conference,—the impression and the charm of which would have been (he fears) destroyed,—if he had too rigidly exercised the office of a critic, in altering, or even curtailing, what some might deem imperfect or exuberant.

But,—passing from the Report of the proceedings of the Conference, to the consideration of the character and proceedings of that Conference,—it may be well to call the attention of the reader to some few points.

And, in the first place, to the fact, so fully and manifestly established, that Christians of all Denominations,—notwithstanding their differences on some points of doctrine, and on some other important points connected with the outward form and ministrations of Religion,—and, notwithstanding the widest differences upon Political questions,—*can, and may, cordially act together*. This Great Conference proclaims to all the World, that—whatever may be said of the divisions and dissensions of Protestants, by those who know not what true Religion is—*they may, and can, act together* upon a great occasion, when a common enemy is at the gates, and their common Faith is assailed or compromised, and conscience is at stake. And why is this? How is it that they can thus meet together, and act together, in harmony and love?

Because, *the things wherein true Christians are agreed, are both more, and more important, than those in which they differ.\**

They have their different ways of expressing themselves on many

---

\* An observation to this effect was made by Philip Henry, who was known by the name of “the Heavenly Henry,” nearly two hundred years ago.

points. They have different forms of Worship. They have all, more or less, their yet remaining errors and imperfections—from which they will not be entirely free till they meet in eternity. The consequence of all this is, that worldly men—the children of this world—who (in regard to Religion) are incapable of looking deeper than the surface—will discern little but differences and disagreements. But all who are capable of seeing deeper—of piercing through the veil of mere outward observances and appearances, so as to enter into the substance and core of Religion—will perceive and acknowledge, that their Religion, after all,—the Religion of all who have anything that is worthy of the name of Christianity,—is really and truly *one*. All true Protestants—all real Christians—have one and the same Religion. And the more they yield themselves up, in body, soul, and spirit, to the power and influence of that Religion, the more manifest will it be, to themselves and to others, that “There is ONE BODY and ONE SPIRIT, even as ye are called in ONE HOPE of your calling; ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM, ONE GOD AND FATHER OF ALL, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.”\* *This* is the secret of that harmony and that love which were so delightfully manifested in the Conference.

And, if this has been *once* so delightfully and remarkably manifested—so plainly and strikingly exhibited to the World,—why should it not be *permanently* manifested? The conflict is not over. The warfare is not ended. We are yet in an enemy’s country; and have further attacks on our common Faith to fear, and future dangers to prepare against. The Pharisees and Sadducees of the age are yet combined, against the cause of Christ and the Truth of His Gospel.

Had Protestants succeeded in their opposition to the Bill for the Endowment of Maynooth, there might, perhaps, have been but too much danger of their forgetting this. The victory would have been delightful and glorious. But it might have made them careless and secure: and the Christian army, which had been gathered together, might have disbanded. The different divisions, of which it was composed, might even have fallen out among themselves; they might have been betrayed again into contentions about minor matters. *But they have been defeated.* HE, whose never-failing Providence ordereth all things in Heaven and earth: HE who doth always what is holiest, wisest, best,—has permitted His children and His servants to be defeated;—though they feel assured that they were fighting His battles. Nay—it is evident, that the enemy, who has *now* prevailed against them, is meditating fresh assaults upon that which they feel to be sacred and holy: *he* has other measures in view, to which they are yet more

---

\* Eph. iv. 4—6.

stedfastly, in their conscientious convictions, opposed. The Protestant army, therefore, must not, even for one moment, dare to think of disbanding. On the contrary, Protestants must be more vigilant, more active, more united. They must muster all their strength, collect all their resources, and gird themselves, betimes, to a yet more arduous contest. They must make it manifest to the World, that they are *yet* united ; and only determined, by the blessing of their God, to be more and more united.

And let it be remembered, in the second place, that, to such permanent Union, the members of the Conference have pledged themselves. The following Resolution was passed unanimously, at the Great Meeting in Exeter Hall on May 1st. (See pp. 207, &c.)

Moved by the Rev. D. R. Stephens, Baptist Minister at Newport, Monmouthshire; seconded by J. Heald, Esq., of Stockport; supported by the Rev. T. D. Gregg, of Dublin ;

“ 3. Resolved—That, in this crisis of our affairs, it becomes us, as a considerate assembly, to look to the future; that it is quite evident to this Meeting, that the Protestant interests of this Empire are put in a state of fearful peril by the course proposed to be pursued by her Majesty's Government; and that, connecting this circumstance with the position of the same sacred interests elsewhere, it becomes their indispensable duty, to arrange for a great Protestant Confederation, to embrace this Country, the Continent, and the World, that, by sympathy, correspondence, and united action, they may be prepared to meet a powerful and united foe.”

And not only was this Resolution passed, but provision was made to carry it into effect; for it was further—

Moved by the Rev. Dr. Halley, of Manchester; seconded by the Rev. Thomas Scales, of Leeds; and

“ 4. Resolved—That, to effect this important object, the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee be requested provisionally to take charge of the requisite arrangements; and be prepared to submit to a General Meeting, called by themselves, the platform and the officers best fitted to sustain and carry on such an Institution.”

And, in reference to this subject, there are some very important observations in the able letter of Dr. Chalmers, which was read by the Chairman, at the conclusion of the Fourth Sitting of the Conference; which was also ordered, by an unanimous Resolution, to be inserted in the Report of its Proceedings.

In the third place,—coming suddenly together, under circumstances of so much excitement, and with so little time for previous preparation,—it is not matter of surprise, nor (duly considered) of regret, that some topics were introduced, in the warmth and fervour of public speaking, on which all the parties assembled could not agree. Besides the Voluntary question, it is evident, that some jarring notes were struck, when the Emancipation Bill, of 1829, was specially referred to; when the

Free Church question was prominently brought forward; and when plans were suggested for giving up the Established Church in Ireland, as a peace-offering to the Romanists. It could not be expected, that those who differ on the question of Establishments should agree upon points like these. And such slight appearances of collision (for they were nothing more) may be instructive in regard to future union and co-operation. They serve to point out, what subjects must be waived, and how far those who differ must mutually bear with each other, in order that they may cordially act together. The great fundamental Doctrines of the Gospel, and the gigantic errors and evils of Popery, as opposed to them,—afford, on the other hand, abundant grounds of cordial union; and all could unite, with one heart and mind, in opposing and denouncing the Endowment of Popery.\*

---

\* The following extract from a speech of the Rev. G. S. Bull, on his return to Birmingham, after the Conference, will serve to illustrate the impression made by its proceedings:—

“In regard to the Conference, he had been at the Committee on the Tuesday evening before its first and great Meeting; and there he found a purpose, on the part of a few Ministers of the Baptist persuasion, to bring into discussion the question of Voluntaryism and Endowments; and he had told those gentlemen plainly, that, if they should prevail in bringing up the one, he was prepared to maintain the other; but, happily, there was no conflict of this kind. The next day (Wednesday) a vigorous attempt was made, by not less than a dozen gentlemen, to bring up this question at the Conference; but the integrity of the honourable Chairman, Sir C. E. Smith, no less than the good sense of the Meeting, completely put it down; and those few gentlemen retired from the Meeting with a most hearty farewell. And he must say, that, throughout the proceedings, the perfect good faith with which the compact was preserved—upon which that Conference was summoned—reflects the highest credit upon the chief Ministers and Members of the Independents who were there; and among others he would especially name Dr. Reed, Mr. Blackburn, Dr. Bennet,\* Mr. Scales, Dr. Raffles, and Mr. Baines, jun. of Leeds. Those gentlemen, retaining their own views of Endowments most firmly, refused, very honourably, every temptation to force an exempted question upon the Meeting. To the ability of the Chairman, and his high principle, the greatest praise was due; and, indeed, but one sentiment, and that a most emphatic one, prevailed towards that excellent gentleman. (Cheers.) Of the character of the Conference, and especially of its first meeting on Wednesday, the 30th of April, he knew not how to speak. It had been his lot to attend, perhaps, more large Meetings than most of that company; many enthusiastic ones, and of the highest respectability; but *that* Meeting he should never forget. Its piety, intelligence, sobriety, and earnestness, he never saw equalled before. *Age* was there, animated with the earnestness of youth; ripe *manhood*, evincing an experienced determination; and *youth*, with its warm blood, yet cooled by discretion. There were men from every province of the Empire—England was represented from Cornwall to the Borders—Ireland from the South, West, and

---

\* Dr. Bennet, who was present at the Conference, is a Wesleyan; and was, perhaps, mistaken for another gentleman of that name.—EDITOR.

Many points might be referred to, which were very ably discussed in the speeches delivered at the Conference, or at the Meeting in Exeter Hall: for example,—The Rev. G. Osborn, in his speech on the evening of the 1st May, brought forward, with peculiar force and clearness, the fact, that it is Protestant England and Scotland that are to pay for the Education of the Popish Priests of Ireland: for he pointed out, that it is *the Income-Tax* which yields to the Government that surplus of revenue, from which, alone, the expense of that Endowment can be supplied: and the Income-Tax does not extend to Ireland: it is paid only by Protestant England and Scotland. But with regard to such points, it must suffice to refer to the full Report which follows, and to commend it to the attentive perusal of Protestants. There is much in it, both to inform the mind, and to cheer the heart. It is now time to return to the narrative of events.

While the Anti-Maynooth Conference was going on,—in which a desire was evinced to *unite all Protestants* in opposition to the Bill,—arrangements were making for holding another Conference, *on peculiar grounds*,—of which it will be necessary to take some notice. It will be observed, that, on Wednesday evening, April 30th, at the Second Sitting of the Conference, a disposition was manifested by a few persons, to introduce the discussion of subjects, on which, it was manifest, there would have been great diversity of opinion. And, when it was ruled,

---

North—Dublin sent its full Protestant tale;—but, of all, he must say, Scotland pleased him best. If he saw there a fair sample of her hardy children, he must venture to assure that meeting, that, let England or Ireland do what they may, Scotland would never bend to the supremacy of Rome. There were some fine men from Scotland—men with good heads and warm hearts:—let the Pope's retainers beware of Scotchmen. But England was there too. Happy was he to meet his brethren of the Church of England in large numbers; and happy to meet a full deputation of the Wesleyans and of the Independents, the conduct of all of whom was highly consistent and honourable. The Conference, on the first day, had full one thousand members, all of one heart and soul; and, besides the fervent spirit of piety, and the hearty expression of Protestant feeling that he witnessed, there was one feature of that Meeting which also delighted him. One speaker—he believed Mr. M'Neile—in his solemn address, bespoke the support of a Protestant people for the *Protestant Throne*,—especially at this time, when her advisers had placed its virtuous possessor in so perilous, equivocal, and embarrassing a position. Instantly, and it would seem unconsciously, the entire assembly rose as one man; and found themselves, in a moment, standing upon the seats from which they had risen, or scarcely upon *them*, for they seemed at that moment to partake of a spiritual elevation;—he would not compare it to that of Lord Shrewsbury's 'Estatica;'—but the enthusiasm of that moment baffled all description. These were not the men that a British Queen, whose '*title deeds*' of her very throne were Protestant, would or could despise: and the day would come, when her imperious Minister would no longer despise them either."

that such discussion was inconsistent with the basis on which the Conference had been invited to meet, a few Gentlemen withdrew from the Meeting—about seven or eight—as stated by some; while others appeared to think, that the whole number might be somewhat greater. Two of these afterwards returned their tickets, with letters addressed to the Chairman, which were read at the last Sitting, on Saturday, May 3, (See Report, pp. 142, 143.) Those Gentlemen, it seems, afterwards met in another room, and drew up a declaration, complaining of the “exclusively ‘*No Popery*’ character of the Conference,” and of the manner in which they had been prevented from bringing forward their peculiar views.\*

On Friday morning, May 2nd, a Public Breakfast was given by the Deputies of the Three Denominations, to their Dissenting brethren from the Country. This was professedly done as an act of hospitality : but it would appear, from the Report of the proceedings in the Patriot Newspaper, that advantage was taken of the occasion, to draw away some of the Deputies from the Country, to a Meeting which was convened the same day in Salters’-Hall Chapel. This Meeting was called to consider, whether it would not be advisable, that the Nonconformists, who so strenuously oppose the Endowment of Maynooth College from the National resources, should inform both Parliament and the public of the real grounds on which *their* opposition was based ; and whether the convening of a Conference of the friends of Religious freedom, throughout all parts of the United Kingdom, would not be the most effectual mode of accomplishing that end.

The result was, the adoption of a series of Resolutions, which are contained in the Circular on the following page, to which the Reader is referred.

In the evening of that day, an aggregate Meeting of the Three Denominations of Protestant Dissenters was held at Finsbury Chapel, to agree on Resolutions, expressive of the grounds on which Protestant Dissenters opposed the Endowment of the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth.

---

\* There seems to be good reason to suppose, that the whole of this disastrous movement (for so it may, under all the circumstances, be considered) was the result of plans which had been previously formed: but—as it is probable that a gentleman, whose position will entitle him to speak out more fully on the subject than would here be desirable, will publish an account of those proceedings, from the first—it is not necessary to enter more at large into this painful history. It will, doubtless, be, to some persons, a matter of surprise, to find,—even in the list of the Committee which was appointed to direct that movement,—the names of some who were also connected with the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee.—EDITOR.

After these preparatory proceedings, the following Circular was issued :—

**“CONVENTION OF PROTESTANT DISSENTERS ON THE MAYNOOTH GRANT.**

“ London, King’s Head Tavern, Poultry, May 6, 1844.

“ Dear Sir,

“ At a numerous meeting of Evangelical Dissenters, convened on Friday last, in Salters’ Hall Chapel, Rev. F. A. Cox, LL.D., in the Chair, the following resolutions were adopted :—

“ That, in the judgment of this meeting, it is a matter of high importance, that the principles on which Nonconformists object to the proposed Endowment of Maynooth College, should be clearly and distinctly understood by both Parliament and the Country ; and that, for this purpose, it is expedient to convene a Conference of the friends of Religious Freedom, to adopt measures to carry on a united and consistent opposition to the Bill now before Parliament relative to the Endowment of Maynooth College, and also to all other State Endowments of any system of religious instruction and worship,

“ That the following gentlemen, with power to add to their number, do form a Committee, to carry the foregoing resolution into effect :—

Rev. J. Alexander, Norwich  
 Rev. J. Bakewell, London  
 Rev. R. S. Bayley, Sheffield  
 Rev. J. Bennett, D.D., London  
 R. Besley, Esq., Holloway  
 Rev. J. Burnet, Camberwell  
 Rev. J. Campbell, D.D., London  
 Rev. J. R. Campbell, M.A., Edinburgh  
 Rev. J. Carlile, Hackney  
 John Childs, Esq., Bungay  
 Josiah Conder, Esq., London  
 Rev. F. A. Cox, D.D., LL.D., Hackney  
 Rev. Dr. Davis, Stepney  
 Rev. R. Eckett, London  
 Rev. W. Forster, Highgate  
 Rev. S. Green, Walworth  
 Rev. R. Halley, D.D., Manchester  
 J. M. Hare, Esq., Hackney

Rev. T. Horton, Devonport  
 St. George D’Arcy Irvine, Esq., London  
 Rev. John Jefferson, Stoke Newington  
 Rev. T. W. Jenkyn, D.D., London  
 Rev. Eliezer Jones, Plymouth  
 Edward Miall, Esq., London  
 Rev. J. Morison, D.D., Brompton  
 Rev. Caleb Morris, London  
 Rev. J. P. Mursell, Leicester  
 Rev. E. Pearson, London  
 Dr. Thomas Price, London  
 Rev. Henry Richards, London  
 Rev. J. Robertson, London  
 Rev. J. Pye Smith, D.D., LL.D.,  
 Hackney  
 Rev. E. Steane, D.D., Camberwell  
 Rev. J. Stevenson, M.A., London  
 Rev. C. Stovel, London

“ In accordance with these resolutions, we beg, on behalf of the Committee, to request, that you will appoint Delegates to attend this Conference, to be holden in London on the 20th instant.

“ Two or more Delegates may be appointed by any Church or Congregation, or by a Public Meeting of Protestant Dissenters called for that purpose. Ministers will be admitted *ex officio*.

“ It is especially desirable, that the Delegates should bring all possible information respecting the way in which Members of Parliament may be influenced in their vote on the Third Reading of the Bill ; and that the elective franchise should



be so used at the next Election as to secure the return of Members who are opposed to all State Endowments of Religion.

"The urgency of the case, and the shortness of the time, demand the utmost promptitude in combining the energies of Dissenters to meet this eventful crisis.

"The Committee meet every day at one o'clock, at the King's Head, in the Poultry; where the Secretaries (to whom all correspondence must be addressed) attend from ten till four, and where ministers and delegates may, on application, obtain tickets of admission.

"We are, dear Sir, yours, &c.,

<p>"F. A. Cox, R. S. BAYLEY, J. P. MURSELL, W. FORSTER,</p>	}	Secretaries.
---	---	--------------

"N.B.—The admission of Delegates will be kept open until the 19th; but, to facilitate the preliminary arrangements, it is earnestly requested that the earliest possible intimation of their appointment may be given to the Secretaries."

A Conference, of such as were opposed to the Maynooth Grant, "on the ground of the evils of all State Endowments of Religion," and which took the title of "The Protestant Dissenters' Anti-Maynooth Conference," was accordingly held at Crosby Hall on the 20th and 21st of May.\*

---

\* It may be right to mention, that the following document had been issued some time before this, by the Dissenting opponents of the Maynooth Endowment Bill.

"At a special Meeting of the General Body of Protestant Dissenting Ministers of the three Denominations, residing in, and about, the Cities of London and Westminster, holden at the Congregational Library, Blomfield-street, on Tuesday, April 1st, 1845,

"The Rev. F. A. Cox, LL.D., D.D., in the Chair,

"It was Resolved—

"I. That this Body has heard with the deepest anxiety and alarm of the proposal of Her Majesty's Government greatly to augment the Parliamentary Grant to the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, in Ireland; and of the intended introduction to the Legislature of a Bill to remove that Grant from the annual votes of the House of Commons, and so to make the Endowment permanent; which, if allowed to become Law, will, in the opinion of this Body, virtually establish Popery in that Country by Act of Parliament.

"II. That, in the judgment of this Body, it is in principle unjust, and in its tendency most mischievous, to appropriate the resources of the State to the Endowment of any Religious Institution whatsoever; and that it is neither unjust nor uncharitable toward the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to demand, that the education of their priesthood be left to the same voluntary support, by which the Seminaries and Colleges of the Nonconformist Ministers of England and Wales have been founded and are sustained.

"III. That, in addition to the general principle on which this Body rests its opposition to the Endowment of Religious Institutions by the State, there are special reasons which greatly increase its hostility to the Measure now proposed to Parliament, and which are deemed worthy of the earnest consideration of all true Protestants.

By this Conference a series of Resolutions was adopted, and an Address to the Roman Catholics of Ireland was drawn up and circulated ; of which it is not here desirable to say much. The whole proceedings, it is to be feared, would appear to those, who desire to promote Union among Protestants, to be only calculated to throw hinderances in the way of that most important object ; while a disposition was not indistinctly manifested, to sacrifice the principles of our common Protestantism, to the mere desire of taking advantage of an opportunity of National excitement, to promote their own plans of opposition to all Establishments or Endowments. It may be fairly questioned, whether the Jesuits themselves could have devised a more effectual method of interfering with the purposes for which the Anti-Maynooth Conference was convened.

The Central Anti-Maynooth Committee had stated from the beginning, "If any think they can work more satisfactorily, or more effectually, *on entirely independent ground, let them do so by all means.*" And it was not the wish of any one connected with that Committee, to speak unkindly of any independent movements,—to which, from the first, they had so cordially wished God speed. And far would it be from their

---

"*First.* Because the doctrines taught at Maynooth College are those of the most rigid school of the Papacy, and which are inculcated by the most accomplished arts of Jesuitism—doctrines which the Protestant Nonconformists of Great Britain and Ireland regard as subversive of the Gospel of Christ, and mischievous alike to the minds, the morals, and the liberties of mankind.

"*Secondly.* Because all history and experience prove, that the varied learning and high accomplishments of the Roman Catholic Clergy throughout the world, have not been acquired for the enlightenment of the people, but have too commonly been employed to increase their intellectual bondage, and their abject submission to priestly usurpation: and, therefore, although the system of education for the Irish priests at Maynooth were greatly improved at the National expense, it will not consequently follow, that the popular mind of Ireland will be advanced thereby, either in knowledge, virtue, or charity.

"*Thirdly.* Because accumulated National sufferings can alone explain the long-continued National agitation of Ireland ; and it is neither righteous nor manly, to attempt to silence the loud complaints of an oppressed and impoverished people, by inducing their priests to employ spiritual power to repress their desires for political rights and social improvement,—to satisfy which seems to be the first duty of enlightened and honest legislation.

"*Fourthly.* Because the Protestant Churches of Europe and America, and their devoted Missionaries throughout the world, have, within the last quarter of a century, suffered much from the exclusive claims, the restless intrigues, and the unscrupulous aggressions of the emissaries of Rome, (the bitter fruits of restoring the order of the Jesuits in 1815,) whilst, in the Established Church of these Realms, there has arisen a party, formidable by their numbers and their talents, who profess warm sympathy with, and profound deference to the Church of Rome,—

thoughts, to offer any objection or hinderance to the full discussion of the question of State Endowments, *in due time and place*. They deeply felt, however, that, under the circumstances of the late eventful struggle, *cordial union and co-operation among all Protestants* was most desirable : for *this* an urgent call, and noble opportunity, seemed to be given; and *Union is Strength*. The question at issue between the Church of Rome and all the Reformed Churches, is (in the unhesitating and unanimous judgment of all Protestants) a question between Scriptural Truth and Anti-Christian error: it is a question of life and death—of spiritual life and spiritual death. It concerns the sublimest and most precious Truths, and rests upon the plainest Testimonies of God's unerring Word. On the other hand, the question of State Endowments (however powerful and weighty the arguments which may be adduced on either side) is a question among devout and conscientious Protestants, as to *the best and wisest means* of maintaining and promoting *that saving Truth*, in which they are all agreed. Whatever be the importance of the latter, *in its place*,—it bears no proportion to the importance and glory of the former. *The means* must be subservient to *the end*: and the order and proportion of Divine Truth require, that—when a great Nation is

---

considerations these, which should not permit any advantages to be conceded to Roman Catholics, beyond those which National justice and equal citizenship demand.

“ IV. That,—as the Nonconformist founders of this Body were amongst the first to welcome the arrival of the Prince of Orange in this ancient Capital, ‘for the security and maintenance of the Protestant Religion;’ and as they employed their best influence to secure the happy Revolution of 1688, and as their immediate successors in the Dissenting Ministry strenuously exerted their best powers to maintain the title of the House of Hanover to the throne of these Realms, against the successive rebellions of the Roman Catholic adherents of the exiled princes of the Stuart family,—so the present crisis demands of this Body, the faithful employment of the best influence it possesses, to avert the calamity now impending; and therefore it resolves to present Petitions to both Houses of Parliament, founded on the first and second of these Resolutions, and to urge upon all the Representatives of the Metropolitan Cities and Boroughs, and of their adjacent Counties, not to lend their support to the unprincipled Measure about to be introduced to the House of Commons.’

(Signed)

“ F. A. Cox, *Chairman*.

THOMAS JAMES, *Secretary*.”

This was an open,—and, at the same time, a calm and moderate statement of the views of Dissenters on the subject. It is also a decidedly *Protestant* document. There is nothing in it, which could have prevented kindly feeling and co-operation, on the part of their Protestant brethren, who take different views on the question of Establishments, and who might have expressed *their* views with equal decision, and with equal moderation. Had the proceedings at Crosby Hall been conducted in this spirit, there would have been no ground for complaint.—EDITOR.

called upon to consider the question between Protestant Truth and Popish error—all questions respecting *means*, should be subordinated to that great question, and wait for a time more suitable to their discussion. Without duly considering the proportion of Divine Truths, and the subordination of one part of Truth to another, there can be no Union among Christians. At such a crisis, cordial and *manifest* Union was most desirable. What was wanted—what the exigency of the time required—was, that Protestant Britain should have spoken out, *with one harmonious voice*, in opposition to Popery. The Voluntaries might have *all* come forward (as many of them did) to swell this harmonious shout,—without appearing to compromise themselves upon the question of Establishments : they might have said enough to clear their own consciences in that matter, without so prominently putting forward their own views as to mar that harmony. Indeed very many of them did so. It is, therefore, the more to be lamented, that the Conference at Crosby Hall should have been permitted to disturb that united utterance of pure Protestant feeling, and to divert a portion of the public enthusiasm at so inopportune a moment—most of all to do so, in such a manner as implied censure of that *United movement*, in which so large a portion of their own brethren were engaged.

Under all the circumstances, this was peculiarly ill-judged and disastrous. It furnished the pretext, which an unchristian Parliament and Government wanted, for disregarding the Petitions of more than 1,200,000 Protestants. It gave them a handle to say, “Those are *not* the Petitions of *Protestants* against *Popery*; but of *Dissenters* against *Endowments*: and we are all pledged already to the principle of Endowments—those who oppose the Bill (generally) as well as those who favour it. *We*, therefore, cannot listen to *such* Petitions.” Alas ! how ready are the enemies of Truth to take advantage of any appearance of division among its friends. Why should any, who know and love the Truth—(and who ought, therefore, to love one another, and to manifest their vital Union in the Truth)—afford them this advantage ?

If it could have been said, on the contrary, with manifest Truth,—“We all unite as Protestants—upon purely Protestant grounds—to denounce the National Endowment of Popery—we merge all our differences *for the time*—we forget them *for the present*—however conscientiously, and earnestly, we might contend for them under other circumstances, The Churchman merges his Churchmanship in his Protestantism—the Dissenter merges his Voluntarism in his Protestantism : we take our stand together, on those great Principles, in which we are all agreed,—to protest, with one voice, against that which all denounce as soul-destroying error,”—if *this* had been the language of the whole movement, and of all the Petitions,—how different must have been the moral weight of

the opposition ! How different might have been the result ! Have we not failed, because we were not sufficiently united ?—we were not so united as Christians should have been,—and, as they must be, in order to prevail.

The proceedings of the Conference were scarcely concluded, when that most interesting and important season commenced, in which the various Religious Societies are accustomed to hold their Anniversary Meetings in the Metropolis. If these Meetings suspended, in a measure, the *more public* operations of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, they also superseded the necessity of them : for almost every important Meeting which was held became, to a certain degree, an *Anti-Maynooth Meeting*. The feeling of the Christian portion of the community was intense, and could not be restrained. Every allusion to the subject, by the various Speakers, was eagerly taken up, and responded to by the multitudes assembled in Exeter Hall from day to day. And those Gentlemen,—especially those Members of Parliament, who had signalized themselves by zealous opposition to the Maynooth Bill,—whenever they appeared on the platform, were received with every possible token of respect and cordial affection.

Some of those Meetings bore more directly upon the principles which were involved in the contest that was going on ;—that of the Protestant Association more especially—which had never, on any occasion, been more crowded, or more enthusiastic. At this Meeting, the Rev. Robert J. M'Ghee made a most important speech ;—illustrating, in the clearest and most forcible manner, the nature of the instruction given at Maynooth, from the Class-books and Standards of the College,—and showing, also, what important information had been tendered to Sir Robert Peel, and urged on his attention : but to which he had resolutely and stubbornly refused to listen. The Correspondence which took place between Mr. M'Ghee and the Premier, on this subject, and which was read by Mr. M'Ghee at that Meeting, was of such a nature as to demand insertion here,—with some of the observations by which it was introduced.

*Extract from a SPEECH of the Rev. J. M'GHEE, M.A., at the Annual Meeting of the Protestant Association, held in the large Room, Exeter Hall, on Wednesday, May 14, 1845, the Right Hon. the Earl of Winchilsea in the Chair.*

“ There is one difficulty that no doubt naturally presents itself—perhaps to all the individuals of this great Meeting—connected with the subject ; and that is, what can remain to be said upon the subject of Maynooth ? It has undergone an unprecedented discussion in the House of Commons ; the talents of the Representatives of the whole Empire have been exhausted upon this subject ; and what can more remain for learning to discover, or ingenuity to invent, to say about Maynooth ? My Lord, I take a very different view of this subject. For, in my judgment, so far

from having been exhausted, the merits of this question have never been discussed in the House of Commons. And this, I confess, presents to my mind one of the darkest features of the iniquity of this Measure; that so far from having been discussed, the merits of this question have not been permitted to be discussed in the House of Commons. Some inquisitorial influence, unknown to the British Constitution, has been exerted over the British Cabinet; and that Cabinet has avowedly quashed that discussion on the very threshold of that House.

“For what is this question, my Lord? what are the merits of this question? what is the question itself? The Prime Minister proposes to endow the College of Maynooth, for the education of a certain class of men. Now it must strike every plain honest man, on the first blush of the thing, that the very first question is, What is this system of education which the Prime Minister proposes to endow? That is *the question*. Every other point is merely an accident of the question; but that is *the question itself*. Now what does the Prime Minister do? He comes down to the House of Commons, and he says—‘I propose to bring in a Bill for the Endowment of this College; but the grace of this act shall not be qualified by any inquiry into the principles of the College to be endowed!’ Now we know that it is generally—universally the case—that all institutions for public education are anxious to proclaim the system on which they instruct. Even a schoolmaster, if he puts an advertisement in the paper, is anxious to proclaim the course of instruction he wishes to adopt in his seminary. It must be certainly, my Lord, a very equivocal, or a very suspicious mode of training the mind of youth, which it is *an act of grace to conceal from the public view*. To whom is this act of grace? On whom is it conferred? Is it on the Nation, or on the system? Perhaps upon the Nation. Perhaps the Minister considers, that the illumination of Maynooth is too bright; that it would dazzle the Empire; that,

“ ‘Its saintly visage is too bright  
To hit the sense of human sight.’

“Or is it an act of grace to the system? Does the Prime Minister suspect—does the Prime Minister believe—does the Prime Minister know, *that that system will not bear the light*; and therefore he will graciously conceal it from the view of the public? Does he mean to say to this great Protestant Empire—‘I choose to endow this College; it may sap your Constitution, it may supersede your Laws, it may supplant your Religion, it may subvert your Throne: but you shall not inquire into the nature of it?’ In what school has the Prime Minister of England begun to learn such an unstatesman-like, unconstitutional, unparliamentary, un-English, un-Protestant mode of Legislation? One would imagine, that he had passed some part of the last recess from Parliament in retreat in the College of Maynooth; that they had invested him with an honorary degree of Doctor of Canon Law; and that he had been studying Reiffenstuel or Devoti upon the subject. ‘The doctrine of the secret’ may do very well for the meridian of Italy; but, thank God, that as yet, neither in the Church, nor in the Constitution, shall it find place within the atmosphere of England.

“My honourable friends, the Member for East Kent, and the Member for Newcastle-under-Lyne, endeavoured, on the 2nd of this month, to force some discussion of this subject in the House of Commons; and they rendered great service to the cause of truth, for they elicited an impotent and irritated denial of the most demonstrable facts; and what did the Prime Minister do? Sir R. Peel stated that ‘he also’ (as well as the Roman Catholic Gentleman who preceded him,) ‘had heard the discus-

sion that had just taken place, with great pain; for of all assemblies, he thought *that* was the least fitted to discuss questions of this nature.' I confess, I read that sentence, coming from such a quarter, with the most profound astonishment. I thought that the business of a Legislative assembly was, most carefully and diligently to discuss every question on which it was to legislate for the Empire. But the only possible conclusion that can be drawn from the assertion of the Right Honourable Baronet is this, that *the House of Commons must be totally incompetent to legislate upon a question, which, by his own confession, it is utterly unfitted to discuss.*

"I feel, in entering upon the subject which I am now about to speak of, the deepest and most solemn regret; for much as I am opposed to this iniquitous and obnoxious Measure, I wish I could oppose it as I ought to do, without casting the least reflection on the Right Hon. Baronet at the head of Her Majesty's Government. But a solemn sense of duty to my God and to my Country, compels me to bear my testimony upon this subject; while, however humble that testimony may be, I greatly miscalculate the sterling public principle of England—I greatly miscalculate the power of public opinion—I greatly miscalculate the force of truth when brought to bear on any man in this Empire—if the Right Hon. Baronet will not be brought to feel, that,—instead of bringing forward his motion for the Third Reading of this Bill on Monday next,—he will find, that it is due to his Country and to himself, rather to bring in a Bill to investigate the College of Maynooth, and those laws which have been set up by the papal bishops of Ireland, against the Laws of that Sovereign who has entrusted him with the administration of her Government.

"It was the twentieth of this month, ten years ago, that my dear and reverend brother, Dr. O'Sullivan, and I first stood upon this platform, to bear our testimony concerning certain principles and documents of the Church of Rome, which appeared, to all who heard and all who were acquainted with the subject, to involve most deeply *the civil, social, political, and Religious interests of this great Empire.* Circumstances led from one discovery to another. Then facts were elicited, truths and documents were discovered, statements were made year after year, which remain to this hour uncontroverted and incontrovertible, respecting the Papacy;—of which I will say, that no man—I care not what his talents may be—is fit to bear a part in the administration of this great Empire, who is not master of these facts, and who has not spirit and principle to deal with them.

"Now I felt it my duty, as the documents had come into my hands—(I thank God they have been now, for some time, lodged in both Universities)—from that year to write on many occasions to Sir Robert Peel. I was most anxious, that these facts should be brought under the cognizance of that Right Hon. Baronet. I knew perfectly well, that it was quite impossible that a person in his high position, could notice any statement, however important, that had been made in a public Meeting, such as those held in Exeter Hall. I knew it was impossible, that a person in his high position could condescend to notice any communication from an individual so insignificant as I am. But I earnestly requested the Right Hon. Baronet, to appoint *in Ireland* some of the most learned and able Lawyers; that he would request that *they* should investigate the documents; that *they* should examine the subject; that *they* should give to him their opinion on the nature and importance of those facts. I requested that the Right Hon. Baronet would appoint any person he pleased *in London*—men of the station, and talent, and information that he would employ; and that he would desire *them* to investigate the subject; and I professed myself most anxious to lay before them any information I could,—so that he might know and

understand the real state of the case, and what he had to deal with in the administration of this great Empire. The Right Hon. Bart. condescendingly acknowledged my communications; *but he most peremptorily refused ever to institute the least inquiry into the subject.* I did not keep copies of my letters; I never thought or intended to mention them, I never thought I should be called on to do so: but before *this* Bill was introduced into Parliament, I took the liberty of writing a letter to the Right Hon. Bart. on the 26th of March, of which I did keep a copy; and which I think, however insignificant the writer, considering the personage to whom it was addressed, it is important to lay before this Meeting and the British public.

“‘TO SIR ROBERT PEEL.

“‘Sir,—Permit me most respectfully to solicit your attention to facts, which I trust may seem to you of sufficient importance to apologize for this intrusion. Having seen, in the proceedings of Parliament, the announcement of your intention to increase the Grant to the College of Maynooth,—an announcement which you perceive has caused a general feeling of excitement in the Country,—I should feel deficient in my duty, were I not to lay before you facts, which my knowledge of the system of instruction pursued in that College enables me to do; and of which authentic records of Parliament will enable you, to a certain extent, to test the truth; which may perhaps suggest to you the importance of that satisfactory investigation of which the whole case is fully susceptible. Allow me to refer you to the 8th Report of the Commissioners of Education, ordered to be printed by the House of Commons June 19th, 1827. This Report, bearing the signatures of the Commissioners, with the Appendix, contains the information to which I especially beg to direct your attention. There are just three points, out of a vast number, on which I would humbly request you to fix it.

“‘I. The communication made, and the directions given, by the Cardinal-prefect of the Propaganda, to the four Roman Catholic Archbishops, and seven Roman Catholic Bishops, trustees of the College of Maynooth, dated July 9th, 1796, the year after the institution of the College of Maynooth, App. No. 7, p. 44; together with the answer from those Archbishops and Bishops, bearing their signatures, pledging themselves to adopt, in that College, the course directed by the Cardinal-prefect of the Propaganda. This immediately follows, p. 46.

“‘II. The returns of the books used in the different classes of the College of Maynooth, and which the students are obliged to procure at their own expense. App. No. 66, p. 449.

“‘III. A list of the works recommended by the Professors of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth for the perusal of the students, or referred to by them in their lectures. App. No. 67, p. 450. Now there seems to be little danger of acting unfairly or unjustly in taking their Standards, principles, and books, on their own authority, thus lodged in the records of Parliament. In the first of these documents, a certain course of instruction on certain peculiar points of difference between Members of the Church of Rome, and a certain Standard on these points, is commanded by the Cardinal-prefect. The Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops pledge themselves to adopt this course. It is, therefore, but common sense to assume, that the books which contain the principles of this course are those really adopted as the Standards of instruction in the College; and that the principles to which the Archbishops and Bishops are pledged to the Propaganda, are those which are really inculcated on the priests. I beg to enclose a statement of what those principles are, the certain essential points, and the means whereby you may satisfactorily prove whether



that statement be true or false. It is of course your desire to legislate with the best information on the subject. I have the honour to be, Sir,

“ ‘Your very obedient, humble servant,

“ ‘R. J. M’GHEE.

“ ‘Dublin, March 26, 1845.’

“ ‘*For the consideration of Sir R. Peel—Statement of principles inculcated on certain points in the College of Maynooth.*

“ ‘If the letter of the Cardinal-prefect of the Propaganda addressed to the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops who are Trustees of that College had been in these terms:—‘ You are to take care, that the course of instruction for the priesthood of Ireland in this College, shall be strictly according to the doctrines of the Ultramontane Church—that they are to be taught, that Kings and Princes are subjected, by the ordinance of God, in temporal as in spiritual things, to the Ecclesiastical powers; that they may be directly, or indirectly, deposed by the power of the keys of the Church, and their subjects absolved from their fidelity and obedience, and their oaths of allegiance;’ ‘ you are to teach them, that the power of the Holy See is not to be restricted by the laws and institutions of the temporal power; that the temporal power is not to rule the spiritual, but the spiritual is, at least indirectly, for the promotion of the spiritual good, to restrain the temporal;’ ‘ you are also to teach them, to hold and maintain the personal infallibility of the Roman Pontiff: and, for this purpose of training the students of the College in these principles,—and training them, according to these, to direct and govern the consciences of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, I recommend, as the best guide for Ecclesiastics, the Compendium of Theology by Peter Dens:’ if the words of the Cardinal-prefect’s letter were those which I have written; and that the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, pledge themselves to adhere to these commands; and that this letter was laid before you, and the fact demonstrated, that they had done what they were thus pledged to do: I do not suppose that Sir R. Peel would feel it consistent with duty to our gracious Sovereign, or the Country, to propose an enlarged Grant to a College pledged to such principles.

“ ‘Now the principles commanded in the express terms of this letter, and the very book containing those principles, are the identical principles, and the identical book, which I have stated. The principal questions which the Cardinal-prefect states,—‘ *quæ in scholarum disputationibus in utramque partem, salva fide et pace, versantur,*’ are these. Every one acquainted with the subject knows, that these are the questions, which they say are not necessary to the Catholic faith, but which constitute the grand points of difference and disputation between the Gallican and Ultramontane churches. These are the points, in which the Cardinal orders the Romish hierarchy, and the hierarchy pledge themselves, to adopt as their *leader* and *master* Thomas Aquinas, and to take care he shall guide the College. If you turn to this Appendix, p. 144, you will perceive, that the Professor of Ethics states the very work of Thomas Aquinas, which (according to this letter and the pledge of the bishops) he adopts, and which he recommends as ‘ one of the best treatises of ethics,’ and on the list of books, p. 450, this book is given by the President as one of the Standards of the College—the ‘ *Secunda Secundæ*.’—Now the *Secunda Secundæ* of Thomas Aquinas is *perfectly identical* with the theology of Dens, the one being merely a digest and compendium of the other; when the one is commanded by the Cardinal-prefect, it is exactly the same as if he commanded the other: when the Bishops are pledged to one, they are pledged to the other: and how well

they have fulfilled that pledge is demonstrated from the fact, that, since the year 1808, the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Ireland had that book of Dens printed for their priests, to direct them, and as their guide when they left Maynooth; and since 1831, it is demonstrable from their own directories, and from the Secret Statutes of the province of Leinster, enacted by the Roman Catholic Bishops in Synod, that they trained their priests in that book, as being the system they had already been taught in Maynooth, for the purpose of fitting them to direct, by this Standard, the consciences of the Roman Catholic population. Now I undertake to prove the following facts as to the principles inculcated in the Class-books and Standards of the College of Maynooth, as returned by the President in the Appendix.

“I. *On Oaths.* First, that the doctrines of all their books on the subject of Oaths is this, that the Bishops have the power of dispensing with every sort of oath by which the conscience of a Roman Catholic can be bound in any obligation, when the Bishop considers that the interest of the Church or Religion may require it; and that no Roman Catholic, who really believes the principles of his Church, could hold his conscience bound to observe an oath, which his Bishop or priest taught him ought to have no obligation on his conscience.

“II. *On Intolerance and Persecution.*—I undertake to prove, from all their books, I mean from the standard books of both the Gallican and Ultra-montane churches (for in this they agree), that the Church of Rome assumes an arbitrary power over every baptized individual; that every Protestant, from the Sovereign to the meanest subject, is declared and asserted to be the subject of the Church of Rome, and to be in a state of revolt and rebellion, because they do not submit to her authority; and thus it is her right and duty, whenever opportunity permits her to do it with a hope of success, to compel them to do so, by the sword, or other means; and that these are the anti-social, intolerant, and persecuting principles inculcated in the Standards and Class-books of Maynooth; and that toleration and liberty of conscience are not to be found among her principles.

“III. *On sedition and rebellion.*—I undertake to demonstrate, that, in the identical author which the Cardinal-prefect commands the Bishops to take for their Standard for this College the year after its foundation, and in the identical works of that author, selected as the Standard of instruction, not only are the doctrines on Oaths and Intolerance found, which I have stated; but the right, the power, are asserted, and the duty is inculcated, of absolving Roman Catholic subjects from their oaths of allegiance to their Protestant Sovereign, when it shall be judged right and expedient to do so; so that, for example, as in the case of a foreign invasion of Ireland, which the Roman Bishops chose to support, the doctrines which they are pledged to teach their priests, empower them, in full accordance with their principles, to absolve the whole Roman Catholic population from every oath of allegiance that could be devised to their Sovereign; and this is the doctrine, not only of Thomas Aquinas, whom they are pledged to follow, but that of their other Standards of the same school, Bellarmine, Devoti, Reiffenstuel, and Maldonatus,—writers on Theology, Canon Law, and Scripture; that these are the principles taught by these authors, and none other, on the subject.

“IV. *On the training of the priests when they leave Maynooth.*—I am prepared to substantiate, on the irrefragable authority of the Directories and Secret Statutes of the Archbishop and Bishops of the Church of Rome in this Province, (Leinster,) that are now lodged, with other books and documents proving the facts, in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, that the compendium of the *Secunda Secunda* of Thomas Aquinas, which chiefly constitutes the Theology of Peter Dens, was adopted by the Romish bishops of all Ireland, in 1808, as the best guide for all the

priests; and that, in 1831, this Theology was adopted by the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Leinster, as the Standard for the secret conferences of their priests in their respective dioceses, by which they are to train their priests to direct the consciences of the people. I am also prepared to demonstrate, that the Romish Archbishop of this Province, Dr. Murray, had published in addition to this, a Compendium of Canon Law, containing the abstracts of papal bulls, decretals, and canons,—some of which he himself and other Bishops had denied to have even an existence, before the Committee of Parliament, in 1825 and 1826; and which I can prove, by their own evidence, are put into force as Ecclesiastical laws, by their publication under Episcopal authority,—which Laws are in direct contravention of the Laws of this Realm, and of the liberties, rights, and safety of her Majesty's subjects, Roman Catholics as well as Protestants,—as also in direct contravention of her own royal Prerogatives. Now, Sir, I am prepared to take the documents and books of the College of Maynooth, and all others to which I have referred; I shall adopt any mode whatever, that you will please to prescribe, of laying them before you, or before any tribunal of authority, public or private, which you may be pleased to direct; only so that you may be put in full possession of the facts, and not legislate without the information which is perfectly at your command, on a subject so deeply involving the moral, religious, social, and political existence of Ireland. I pledge myself to this statement.

“ ‘ROBT. J. M'GHEE.

“ ‘*March 26th, 1845.*'

“ To this letter I received the following answer :—

“ ‘ Whitehall, March 29th, 1845.

“ ‘Sir R. Peel presents his compliments to Mr. M'Ghee, and begs leave to acknowledge the receipt of Mr. M'Ghee's communication of the 26th of March. Sir R. Peel has read the Report and Evidence of the Commissioners of Inquiry, referred to by Mr. M'Ghee, and does not consider it to be necessary to avail himself of the offer conveyed in Mr. M'Ghee's letter.' ”

It is well that all the Protestants of this Country should know, with what wilfulness and stubbornness the Prime Minister of our Protestant Queen has shut his eyes against the light; and has determined, that the Parliament of Great Britain should legislate in the dark, upon a question, in which the stability of his Sovereign's Throne, and the Liberties of her subjects, are alike involved.

The Rev. Gentleman then entered upon the proof of those points, to which he had endeavoured in vain to direct the attention of Sir Robert Peel. And certainly he illustrated and proved them in a manner which carried the whole Meeting along with him: and it would be well that his Speech, and the information it contains, could be put into the hands of every Protestant in the Empire. But *here*, the foregoing extract will suffice.

Notwithstanding the strong and decided manifestation of Protestant feeling evinced by so many Meetings, and so many Petitions,—and notwithstanding the mass of evidence against the instruction given at Maynooth, which was, in various ways, brought forward—Sir Robert

Peel persevered in his determination to carry the Measure ; and it was, during *this* period, going through the Committee in the House of Commons. Various Amendments were proposed, and several Divisions took place upon particular clauses of the Bill. But the same determination in opposing the Bill, *within the House*, was not manifested, which was so evidently felt *out of the House*,—or, which was, indeed, expected by many. It had been said, that there were *twelve men*, who were determined rather to die on the floor of the House, than suffer the Bill to pass : but the opposition, which was made in Committee, did not exhibit anything of this determined spirit. The circumstances (it was thought by many) would have warranted the utmost extent of such opposition, as would, in another case, have been most justly considered factious—as was ably stated by the Rev. H. M'Neile, at the first Meeting of the Conference, (see Report, pp. 15, 16 :) and the Rev. T. D. Gregg had shown much ability in drawing up a series of Amendments, the discussion of which would have brought out the iniquity of the Measure,—and would have occupied the House of Commons until now, had Members been disposed to take them up, (see Report, pp. 115–120.) But, perhaps it required *super-human* fortitude to take such a decided stand, and to persevere in such a determined course as was thus marked out,—especially when the present constitution and temper of the House of Commons are taken into consideration. It is, however, due to those Honourable Members, who opposed the Bill, to state, that there is every reason to believe they consulted together, and deliberated on the best means of opposing the Bill. Some information, on this point, was given at a Meeting at Birmingham, on Monday, May 12th, when the Rev. George Bull was called upon, and stated, that—

“ In fulfilment of the wishes of that Committee, he had taken the earliest opportunity of proceeding to Town ; and commenced, on the Monday he arrived there, his applications to all the Members of the House of Commons, to whom he had or could get access. After reporting his arrival to the Committee of Conference, he had seen Lord Ashley and Sir Robert Inglis, who were esteemed Chiefs of the Party opposed to the Endowment of Popery and its doctrines ; and he had represented to those Hon. Members, the intense Religious feeling against the Bill which pervaded the Protestant people of Birmingham generally. The honest determination of the veteran, Sir R. Inglis, and his Noble Colleague in this work, were undoubted. It seems to be the judgment of those Hon. Members, that further opposition should be reserved to the *Third Reading* of the Bill, which had been postponed to the next Monday, when at least three nights' debate might be expected. The subject was by no means exhausted ; and the reference of Sir Robert Peel to the report of the Commissioners on Education in Ireland (1827,) had led many Hon. Members to look more into the question than they had done, and he believed much yet remained to be said. He had chiefly occupied himself in waiting upon Hon. Members of the House of Commons ; he had also seen some of the Peers. A meeting had been held at the house of an Hon. Member, to consider of the course to be taken in Committee on the Bill : but the general opinion was, that further

opposition would be best deferred till the Third Reading. The leaders of that opposition claimed, very justly, the credit of being as fervently and zealously disposed as himself, or any of his constituents, could be; but their experience of what was likely to be effective in the House, and influential in the other House, was such as to warrant him in concluding, that they had exercised a wise discretion in organizing no opposition to the Bill in Committee. From both the Hon. Members for the Borough, and from Mr. Newdegate, he had received the kindest aid. Mr. Muntz, with that manliness which characterized him, had viewed in a proper light, those puerile attacks upon him which had appeared in one of the public prints of this town—and which he had sustained, little moved thereby, from private communications. That Hon. Member's views of the ground of opposition did, indeed, differ from his; but he could not but deeply respect the straightforward conduct of Mr. Muntz, and the ability with which he had exposed the hollowness and inconsistency of the motley group which constituted the unhappy Premier's majority. From Mr. Spooner he had received the most kind assistance also; he had allowed him to invade his domicile early and late, whenever the Protestant cause could be served by that able assistance which his standing and experience enabled him to render. He had not confined his communications to the Protestant minority, but had assailed such of the Pope's majority as he could get access to, and had tried to carry the war into the enemy's camp. And he trusted that the united efforts of the deputies, in calling upon their Representatives generally, had been useful. Lord Ingestre had promised to urge, that the Bill should be limited to *three years*. Lord Francis Egerton had given his constituents his notice to quit, and deliver up his representative post; and many other Members, he believed, would receive such notices, if they did not forestall their constituents by giving them."

But while British Protestants would have been glad to see, and some of them perhaps expected, more of determined resolution and perseverance on the part of those who opposed the Bill,—they certainly, with one voice, would express their disappointment and sorrow, that some, of whom they hoped better things—whom they regarded as Christian brethren, should have given their votes, and the weight and influence of their names and character, to such an unrighteous and unchristian Measure. It cannot but be considered as showing very great ignorance of the true character of Popery—such ignorance as is inexcusable in any one who professes to know and love his Bible—that any one who feels the influence and importance of true Religion, should be beguiled to give his support to the Endowment and inculcation of Popery—and especially *such* Popery as is taught at Maynooth,—where it certainly reigns in its worst and most unmitigated form. How can such men expect to be received with respect, or listened to with confidence, when they appear on the platform of those Religious Societies, whose operations the Priests of Maynooth will and must do their utmost to oppose and counteract?

The Third Reading of the Bill was moved, as was expected, on Monday, May 19, when again a multitude of Petitions, against the Grant, were presented,—one of which was signed by 20,000 people. Mr.

Banks then moved, that the Bill should be read that day six months, which was seconded by Sir R. H. Inglis. The Debate was continued for three nights—the Speakers being

May 19th.

*G. Banks*

F. A. M'Geachy

Ross Donnelly Mangles

Mr. B. Escott

*R. Spooner*

C. Buller

Sir V. Blake, Bart.

Lord Ingestre

May 20th.

Sir H. W. Barron

*A. Lawson*

Hon. H. Cholmondeley

*J. Ffolliott*

R. Godson

Colonel Rawdon

*F. Shaw*

J. M. Gaskell

R. M. Bellew

*Sir R. H. Inglis, Bart.*

May 21st.

*Colonel Verner*

Lord H. Vane

*J. C. Colquhoun*

F. Mackenzie

T. Wyse

*G. Darby*

Sir James Graham, Bart.

Rt. Hon. R. Lalor Sheil

*J. P. Plumptre*

Serjeant Murphy

*W. B. Ferrand*

Captain Layard

Lord F. Egerton

Sir R. Peel, Bart.

Lord John Russell

*G. Palmer*

Hereupon, the House divided, when there appeared

For the Amendment . . . . . 184

For the Third Reading . . . . . 317

Majority 133

The Bill was then read a third time. On the question, that it do pass, Mr. T. S. Duncombe moved the following clause, as a Rider to it :

“And be it Enacted, That the powers and provisions of this Act shall not continue and be in force longer than the 1st of August, 1848, and from thence to the end of the then next Session of Parliament.”

Upon which, the House divided, after a few remarks from Sir Robert Peel, and there appeared

Ayes . . . . . 145

Noes . . . . . 243

Majority 98

The Times Newspaper, of May 23, published a List and Analysis of the Division, with a List of the absent Members,—noting also, how they had voted on the Second Reading. Some corrections have been made in that List, by reference to the Parliamentary Paper, &c.—which, it is hoped, will make the following List sufficiently accurate.

### “THE MAYNOOTH COLLEGE BILL.

“Order of the Third Reading read; Motion made, and Question proposed, ‘That the Bill be now read the third time.’ Amendment proposed, to leave out the word ‘now’ and at the end of the question to add the words ‘upon this day six months.’ Question put, ‘That the word ‘now’ stand part of the question.’ The House divided—Ayes, 317; Noes, 184.

“The 169 names marked with an asterisk in the following list are those of Gentlemen who generally oppose the Government:—

#### MAJORITY—AYES.

- |                              |                              |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| *Acheson, Viscount           | *Browne, Hon. W.             |
| Acland, Sir T. D.            | Brownrigg, J. Studholme      |
| Acland, T. D.                | Bruce, Lord Ernest           |
| A’Court, Captain             | *Bulkeley, Sir R. B. W.      |
| Adare, Viscount              | *Buller, Charles             |
| Adderley, C. Bowyer          | *Buller, Edward              |
| *Ainsworth, P.               | *Butler, Pierce Somerset     |
| *Aldam, W.                   | *Byng, G.                    |
| *Anson, Hon. Colonel         | *Byng, Right Hon. G. S.      |
| *Archbold, R.                | Cardwell, E.                 |
| *Arundel and Surrey, Earl of | *Carew, Hon. R. S.           |
| Bagot, Hon. W.               | Carew, W. H. P.              |
| Baillie, Colonel             | Castlereagh, Viscount        |
| *Baine, W.                   | *Cavendish, Hon. C. C.       |
| Baird, W.                    | *Cavendish, Hon. G. H.       |
| *Barclay, D.                 | *Chapman, B.                 |
| Barkly, H.                   | Chelsea, Viscount            |
| *Baring, Rt. Hon. F. T.      | *Childers, J. W.             |
| Baring, T.                   | Cholmondeley, Hon. Hugh      |
| Baring, Rt. Hon. W. B.       | *Clay, Sir W.                |
| *Barnard, E. G.              | Clayton, Rice R.             |
| Barrington, Viscount         | *Clements, Viscount          |
| *Barron, Sir H. Winston      | Clerk, Right Hon. Sir G.     |
| Bell, M.                     | Clifton, J. T.               |
| *Bell, J.                    | Clive, Viscount              |
| *Bellew, R. M.               | Clive, Hon. R. H.            |
| Bentinck, Lord G.            | *Cobden, R.                  |
| Blackburne, J. I.            | Cockburn, Right Hon. Sir G.  |
| *Blake, Sir V.               | *Colborne, Hon. W. N. Ridley |
| Blakemore, R.                | *Colebrooke, Sir T. E.       |
| Bodkin, W. H.                | *Collett, J.                 |
| Boldero, H. G.               | *Collins, W.                 |
| Borthwick, P.                | Coote, Sir C. H.             |
| Botfield, B.                 | *Corbally, Matthew Elias     |
| *Bowes, John                 | Corry, Right Hon. H.         |
| Bowles, Admiral              | Courtenay, Lord              |
| *Bowring, Dr.                | *Cowper, Hon. W. F.          |
| Bramston, T. W.              | *Craig, W. Gibson            |

- Cripps, W.  
 \*Dalmeny, Lord  
   Damer, Hon. Colonel  
   Davies, D. A. S.  
 \*Dawson, Hon. T. Vesey  
 \*Denison, W. J.  
 \*Denison, J. Evelyn  
 \*Dennistoun, J.  
 \*D'Eyncourt, Right Hon. C. T.  
   Dickinson, F. H.  
 \*Divett, E.  
   Dodd, G.  
   Douglas, Sir C. E.  
   Douro, Marquis of  
   Drummond, H. Horne  
 \*Duncan, Viscount  
 \*Duncannon, Viscount  
 \*Dundas, F.  
 \*Dundas, D.  
   East, James Buller  
 \*Easthope, Sir J.  
   Eastnor, Viscount  
 \*Ebrington, Viscount  
 \*Ellice, Right Hon. E.  
 \*Elphinstone, Howard  
   Emlyn, Viscount  
   Escott, Bickham  
 \*Esmonde, Sir T.  
   Estcourt, T. G. B.  
 \*Etwall, Ralph  
 \*Ferguson, Colonel  
 \*Ferguson, Sir R. A.  
   Fitzmaurice, Hon. W.  
   Fitzroy, Hon. Henry  
 \*Fitzwilliam, Hon. G. W.  
 \*Fleetwood, Sir P. Hesketh  
   Flower, Sir James  
 \*Forster, M.  
 \*Fox, C. R.  
   Fremantle, Right Hon. Sir T.  
 \*French, Fitzstephen  
   Gardner, J. Dunn  
   Gaskell, James Milnes  
 \*Gibson, T. Milner  
 \*Gill, T.  
   Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E.  
   Gladstone, Captain  
   Glynne, Sir S. R.  
   Godson, R.  
   Gordon, Hon. Captain  
   Gore, Montague  
 \*Gore, Hon. Robert  
   Goulburn, Right Hon. H.  
   Graham, Right Hon. Sir J.  
   Granby, Marquis of  
 \*Granger, T. Colpitts  
   Greene, T.  
 \*Grey, Right Hon. Sir G.  
 \*Guest, Sir J.  
   Hale, R. Blagden  
   Halford, Sir H.  
 \*Hall, Sir B.  
   Hamilton, W. J.  
   Hamilton, Lord Claud  
   Harcourt, G. Granville  
   Hatton, Captain Villiers  
 \*Hawes, B.  
 \*Hayter, W. G.  
   Heneage, G. H. Walker  
 \*Heneage, E.  
   Henniker, Lord  
   Herbert, Right Hon. Sidney  
 \*Heron, Sir Robert  
   Hervey, Lord Alfred  
   Hinde, J. Hodgson  
 \*Hobhouse, Right Hon. Sir J. C.  
   Hogg, J. Weir  
 \*Hollond, R.  
   Holmes, Hon. W. A'Court  
   Hope, Hon. C.  
   Hope, G. W.  
 \*Horsham, E.  
 \*Howard, Hon. C. W. G.  
 \*Howard, Hon. E. G. G.  
 \*Howard, P. H.  
 \*Howard, Sir Ralph  
 \*Hume, Joseph  
 \*Hutt, W.  
   Ingestre, Viscount  
 \*James, W.  
   James, Sir Walter C.  
   Jermyn, Earl  
   Jocelyn, Viscount  
   Johnstone, Sir J.  
   Kelly, Fitz Roy  
 \*Labouchere, Right Hon. H.  
 \*Lambton, Hedworth  
   Lascelles, Hon. W. S.  
 \*Layard, Captain  
 \*Leader, J. Temple



- Legh, G. Cornwall  
 \*Lemon, Sir C.  
 Lennox, Lord Arthur  
 \*Leveson, Lord  
 Liddell, Hon. H. T.  
 Lincoln, Earl of  
 Lindsay, Hugh Hamilton  
 \*Listowel, Earl of  
 \*Loch, James  
 \*Macaulay, Right Hon. T. B.  
 Mackenzie, W. Forbes  
 Mackinnon, W. A.  
 \*Macnamara, Major  
 M'Geachy, Forster Alleyne  
 M'Neill, Duncan  
 Mahon, Viscount  
 \*Mangles, Ross Donnelly  
 Manners, Lord C. S.  
 Manners, Lord J.  
 \*Marshall, W.  
 \*Martin, J.  
 Martin, C. Wykeham  
 \*Martin, T. B.  
 \*Matheson, James  
 Milnes, R. Monckton  
 \*Mitcalfe, H.  
 \*Mitchell, T. A.  
 Mordaunt, Sir J.  
 \*Morison, General  
 \*Murphy, F. Stack  
 \*Murray, A.  
 \*Napier, Sir C.  
 Neville, Ralph  
 Newport, Viscount  
 Nicholl, Right Hon. J.  
 Norreys, Lord  
 \*Norreys, Sir Denham Jephson  
 \*O'Brien, J.  
 \*O'Connell, M. J.  
 \*O'Connor Don  
 \*O'Ferrall, R. More  
 \*Ord, W.  
 Ossulston, Lord  
 Oswald, Alex.  
 \*Oswald, James  
 Owen, Sir J.  
 \*Paget, Colonel  
 Pakington, J. S.  
 \*Palmerston, Viscount  
 \*Parker, J.  
 Patten, J. Wilson  
 Peel, Right Hon. Sir R.  
 Peel, Jonathan  
 \*Pendarves, E. W. W.  
 Pennant, Hon. Colonel  
 \*Philips, G. R.  
 \*Philips, Mark  
 \*Phillpotts, J.  
 \*Pigot, Right Hon. D.  
 Pigot, Sir R.  
 \*Power, James  
 Praed, W. T.  
 Pusey, P.  
 \*Rawdon, Colonel  
 \*Redington, T. N.  
 Reid, Sir J. Rae  
 Repton, G. W. J.  
 \*Rice, E. Royd  
 \*Roche, Edmund B.  
 \*Roebuck, J. A.  
 \*Ross, D. R.  
 Round, J.  
 Rous, Hon. Captain  
 \*Rumbold, C. Edward  
 \*Russell, Lord J.  
 \*Russell, Lord E.  
 Russell, C.  
 Sandon, Viscount  
 \*Seymour, Lord  
 Seymour, Sir Horace Beauchamp  
 \*Sheil, Right Hon. R. Lalor  
 \*Shelburne, Earl of  
 \*Smith, B.  
 \*Smith, Right Hon. R. Vernon  
 Smith, Right Hon. T. B. Cusack  
 Smythe, Hon. G.  
 \*Somers, J. Patrick  
 Somerset, Lord Granville  
 \*Somerville, Sir W. M.  
 Somes, Joseph  
 \*Standish, C.  
 \*Stansfield, W. R. Crompton  
 \*Stanton, W. H.  
 \*Staunton, Sir G. T.  
 Stewart, J.  
 \*Stuart, Lord James  
 \*Stuart, W. Villiers  
 \*Strutt, E.  
 Sutton, Hon. H. M.  
 \*Tancred, H. W.

Tennent, James Emerson  
 Thesiger, Sir F.  
 Tollemache, Hon. F. J.  
 Tomline, G.  
 \*Towneley, J.  
 \*Traill, G.  
 \*Trelawney, J. Salusbury  
 Trench, Sir F. W.  
 Trevor, Hon. G. Rice  
 \*Tuite, Hugh Morgan  
 \*Vane, Lord Harry  
 Vernon, Granville Harcourt  
 \*Villiers, Hon. C.  
 Villiers, Viscount  
 \*Walker, R.  
 \*Wall, C. Baring  
 Walsh, Sir J. B.  
 \*Warburton, H.  
 \*Ward, H. G.  
 \*Watson, W. H.  
 \*Wawn, J. Twizell  
 Wellesley, Lord C.

\*Wemyss, Captain  
 \*Westenra, Hon. J.  
 \*White, Samuel  
 Whitmore, T. Charlton  
 \*Wilde, Sir T.  
 \*Williams, W.  
 \*Wilshire, W.  
 \*Winnington, Sir T. E.  
 Wodehouse, Edmond  
 \*Wood, C.  
 Wood, Colonel T.  
 \*Worsley, Lord  
 Wortley, Hon. J. Stuart  
 \*Wrightson, W. Battie  
 Wynn, Right Hon. C. W. W.  
 Wynn, Sir Watkin W.  
 \*Wyse, T.  
 Yorke, Hon. Eliot T.  
 \*Yorke, H. Redhead  
 Tellers.  
 Young, J.  
 Baring, H. B.

#### MINORITY—NOES.

The 151 names marked with an asterisk in the following list, are those of Conservatives, who have, until now, generally supported the Government:—

\*Ackers, James  
 \*Acton, Colonel  
 \*Alexander, Nathaniel  
 \*Allix, J. P.  
 \*Antrobus, Edmund  
 \*Arbuthnott, Hon. Hugh  
 \*Archdall, Captain Mervyn  
 \*Arkwright, G.  
 \*Ashley, Lord  
 \*Astell, W.  
 \*Austen, Colonel  
 \*Bailey, Joseph, jun.  
 Bannerman, A.  
 \*Bateson, T.  
 \*Beckett, W.  
 \*Beresford, Major  
 Berkeley, Hon. Craven  
 \*Bernard, Viscount  
 \*Blackstone, W. Seymour  
 Blewitt, Reginald J.  
 Bouverie, Hon. E. Pleydell  
 \*Boyd, J.  
 \*Bradshaw, James

Bright, J.  
 \*Brisco, Musgrave  
 \*Broadley, H.  
 Brocklehurst, J.  
 Brotherton, Joseph  
 \*Bruce, C. L. Cumming  
 \*Bruen, Colonel  
 \*Bruges, W. H. Ludlow  
 \*Buck, Lewis W.  
 \*Buckley, Edmund  
 \*Buller, Sir J. Yarde  
 \*Burrell, Sir C. M.  
 \*Burroughes, H. N.  
 \*Campbell, J. H.  
 \*Chapman, Aaron  
 \*Chetwode, Sir J.  
 \*Christopher, R. Adam  
 \*Codrington, Sir W.  
 \*Cole, Hon. H. A.  
 \*Colquhoun, J. C.  
 \*Colville, C. R.  
 \*Compton, H. Combe  
 \*Connolly, Colonel

- \*Copeland, Alderman
- Crawford, W. Sharman
- Curteis, Herbert Barrett
- \*Darby, G.
- \*Dawnay, Hon. W. H.
- \*Deedes, W.
- \*Denison, E. Beckett
- \*Dick, Quintin
- \*Disraeli, B.
- \*Douglas, Sir Howard
- \*Douglas, James D. S.
- Duke, Sir James
- Duncan, G.
- Duncombe, T. S.
- \*Duncombe, Hon. O.
- Dundas, Admiral
- \*Du Pré, C. G.
- \*Eaton, R. Jefferson
- \*Egerton, W. Tatton
- \*Egerton, Sir Philip
- \*Entwisle, W.
- Ewart, W.
- \*Farnham, E. Basil
- \*Feilden, W.
- Fielden, John
- \*Fellowes, E.
- \*Ferrand, W. Busfeild
- \*Filmer, Sir Edmund
- \*Fitzroy, Lord C.
- \*Ffolliott, J.
- \*Forbes, W.
- \*Forman, T. Seaton
- \*Fox, Sackville Lane
- \*Fuller, Augustus Elliott
- \*Gore, W. Ormsby
- \*Gore, W. R. Ormsby
- \*Goring, C.
- \*Greenall, P.
- \*Gregory, W. H.
- \*Grimsditch, T.
- \*Grogan, E.
- Hallyburton, Lord J. F. Gordon
- \*Hamilton, J. Hans
- \*Hamilton, G. A.
- \*Hampden, Renn
- \*Hanmer, Sir J.
- \*Harris, Hon. Captain
- Hastie, Archibald
- Heathcoat, J.
- \*Henley, Joseph Warner
- Hill, Lord Marcus
- Hindley, C.
- \*Hornby, J.
- \*Hughes, W. Bulkeley
- Humphery, Alderman
- \*Hussey, Ambrose
- \*Hussey, T.
- Jervis, J.
- Johnson, General
- \*Johnstone, Hope
- \*Jolliffe, Sir W. G. Hylton
- \*Jones, Captain
- \*Kemble, H.
- \*Kirk, P.
- \*Knight, F. Winn
- \*Knightly, Sir C.
- \*Law, Hon. C. Ewan
- \*Lawson, Andrew
- \*Lefroy, Anthony
- \*Leslie, C. Powell
- \*Loftus, Viscount
- \*Lopes, Sir Ralph
- \*Lowther, Sir J. H.
- \*Lowther, Hon. Colonel
- \*Mackenzie, T.
- \*Maclean, Donald
- M'Taggart, Sir J.
- \*Mainwaring, Townshend
- \*Marton, G.
- \*Masterman, J.
- \*Maunsell, T. P.
- \*Maxwell, Hon. James Pierce
- \*Miles, P. W. S.
- \*Morgan, C.
- Morris, David
- \*Mundy, E. Miller
- Muntz, G. F.
- \*Neeld, Joseph
- \*Neeld, John
- \*Newdegate, C. Newdigate
- \*Newry, Viscount
- \*Northland, Viscount
- \*O'Brien, A. Stafford
- \*Packe, C. W.
- \*Palmer, R.
- \*Palmer, G.
- Pattison, James
- Pechell, Captain
- Philipps, Sir R. B. P.
- \*Plumtre, J. P.

\*Polhill, F.  
 \*Pollington, Viscount  
 \*Powell, Colonel  
 \*Price, Richard  
   Protheroe, E.  
 \*Rashleigh, W.  
 •Rendlesham, Lord  
 \*Richards, Richard  
 \*Rolleston, Colonel  
 \*Round, C. Gray  
 \*Rushbrooke, Colonel  
 \*Ryder, Hon. Granville D.  
 \*Shaw, Right Hon. F.  
 \*Shirley, Evelyn J.  
 \*Shirley, E. Philip  
 \*Sibthorp, Colonel  
 \*Smith, Abel  
 \*Smyth, Sir H.  
 \*Spooner, Richard  
 \*Spry, Sir S. T.  
 \*Stanley, E.

Stewart, Patrick Maxwell  
 \*Stuart, H.  
 \*Taylor, E.  
 \*Taylor, J. Arthur  
 \*Thompson, Mr. Alderman  
 \*Tollemache, J.  
 \*Tower, Christopher  
 \*Trollope, Sir J.  
   Troubridge, Sir E. T.  
   Turner, Edmund  
 \*Turnor, Christopher  
 \*Tyrell, Sir J. Tyssen  
 \*Verner, Colonel  
 \*Vyvyan, Sir Richard  
 \*Waddington, Harry S.  
   Wakley, T.  
 \*Welby, Glynne Earle

Tellers.

\*Inglis, Sir R. H.  
 \*Bankes, G.

"The following is a list of the 74 Conservatives absent, with the votes of those who were present upon the Second Reading. Those marked (I) are Irish Members:—

Alford, Viscount  
 Ashley Cooper, Hon. H.  
 Attwood, J.  
 Attwood, Matthias  
 Bagge, W., against 2nd reading.  
 Bailey, Joseph  
 Baillie, H. J.  
 Baldwin, C. Barry  
 Balfour, J. Maitland (in Scotland)  
 Barneby, J., for 2nd reading  
 Baskerville, T. B. M., against 2d reading.  
 Benbow, J.  
 Benett, J.  
 Broadwood, H., for 2nd reading (abroad)  
 Brooke, Sir A. B., against 2d reading  
   (Ireland.)  
 Bunbury, T. (I)  
 Campbell, Sir Hugh, for 2d reading  
   (Scotland.)  
 Carnegie, Captain, for 2d reading.  
 Cartwright, W. Ralph  
 Charteris, Hon. F., for 2d reading (ill)  
 Chute, W. L. W.  
 Cochrane, A. (abroad)  
 Collett, W. Rickford (abroad)  
 Cresswell, A. J. Baker  
 Dowdeswell, W., for 2d reading.

Dugdale, W. S., against 2d reading.  
 Duncombe, Captain, for 2d reading.  
 Egerton, Lord F., for 2d reading (ill)  
 Follett, Sir W. W., for 2d reading (ill)  
 Forester, G. Cecil (abroad)  
 Grimston, Viscount  
 Hamilton, Captain C. J. B. (abroad)  
 Hardy, J., against 2d reading.  
 Hayes, Sir E. (I) against 2d reading.  
 Heathcote, Sir W., for 2d reading.  
   (abroad.)  
 Hepburn, Sir T. B., against 2d reading.  
   (Scotland.)  
 Hodgson, F., against 2d reading.  
 Hodgson, R.  
 Hope, Alexander  
 Hotham, Lord  
 Houldsworth, T.  
 Irton, Samuel  
 Irving, J. (I) for 2d reading.  
 Ker, David Stewart (I)  
 Kerrison, Sir E. (ill)  
 Knight, H. Gally, for 2d reading (ill)  
 Lockhart, W.  
 Long, Walter, against 2d reading.  
 Lyall, G., for 2d reading.  
 Lygon, General

March, Earl of, for 2d reading.	Smollett, A., against 2d reading.
Meynell, Captain (I)	Somerton, Viscount
Mildmay, H. S., for 2d reading.	Sotheron, T. H. S., for 2d reading.
Miles, W.	Sturt, H. C.
Morgan, Octavius	Thornhill, G.
Paget, Lord W., for 2d reading.	Trotter, J.
Pringle, A., against 2d reading.	Vesey, Hon. T. (I)
Ramsay, W. Ramsay	Vivian, J. Ennis
Russell, J. D. W., for 2d reading.	Williams, T. Peers
Sanderson, R., against 2d reading.	Wood, Colonel
Scott, Hon. F.	Wortley, Hon. James S., for 2d reading.
Sheppard, T., for 2d reading.	Wyndham, Colonel, against 2d reading.

“The following is a list of the 75 Liberals absent, with the votes of those who were present at the Second Reading. Those marked (I), as in the former list, are Irish Members, most of whom have been systematically absent this session.

Aglionby, H. A., for 2d reading.	Howard, Hon. Capt. H., for 2d reading.
Armstrong, Sir A., for 2d reading.	Howick, Lord, for 2d reading.
Berkeley, Hon. Captain	Hurst, R. H.
Berkeley, Hon. H. F.	Kelly, James
Berkeley, Hon. Grantley	Langston, James H., for 2d reading.
Bernal, Ralph	Langton, W. Gore
Blake, Mark (I)	Maher, Nicholas (I)
Blake, M. J., for 2d reading.	Marjoribanks, Stewart
Bodkin, J. J. (I)	Marsland, H.
Bridgeman, Hewitt (I)	Maule, Fox, against 2d reading.
Browne, Rob. Dillon (I)	Morrison, James
Busfield, W.	O'Brien, Cornelius (I)
Butler, Hon. Colonel	O'Brien, W. Smith (I)
Callaghan, D. (I)	O'Connell, D. (I)
Cayley, E. Stillington (I)	O'Connell, Maurice (I)
Christie, W. D., against 2d reading	O'Connell, J. (I)
Clive, E. Bolton	Ogle, Savile C. H.
Currie, Raikes, for 2d reading.	Osborne, Captain Ralph
Dalrymple, Captain, for 2d reading.	Paget, Lord Alfred, for 2d reading.
Dashwood, G. H.	Plumridge, Captain
Drax, J. S. W. Erle	Ponsonby, Hon. C., for 2d reading.
Duff, James	Powell, Caleb (I)
Dundas, Hon. J. C.	Pryse, Pryse
Ellice, E., jun.	Pulsford, R.
Ellis, Wynn	Ramsbottom, J.
Evans, W.	Ricardo, J. Lewis
Fitzgerald, R. A. (I)	Rutherford, A., for 2d reading.
Gisborne, T., against 2d reading.	Scott, R., for 2d reading.
Grattan, H. (I)	Scrope, G. Poulett, for 2d reading.
Grosvenor, Lord Robert	Smith, J. Abel, for 2d reading.
Hay, Sir Andrew Leith	Stanley, Hon. W. Owen
Heathcote, Gilbert J.	Stock, Serjeant (I), for 2d reading.
Hoskins, Kedgwin	Strickland, Sir G.
Howard, Hon. Jas. K., for 2d reading.	Sheridan, R. B., for 2d reading.

Talbot, C. R. M., against 2d reading.	Vivian, Hon. Captain
Thornely, T., for 2d reading.	White, H. (I)
Tufnell, H.	Wood, Benjamin
Vivian, J. H., for 2d reading.	

The following summary of the Division will be found correct :—

MAJORITY (tellers included)—						
Conservatives	..	..	..	..	..	150
Liberals	..	..	..	..	..	169
						— 319
MINORITY (tellers included)—						
Conservatives	..	..	..	..	..	152
Liberals	..	..	..	..	..	34
						— 186
ABSENT—						
Conservatives	..	..	..	..	..	74
Liberals	..	..	..	..	..	75
						— 149
Speaker	..	..	..	..	..	1
SEATS VACANT—						
Downshire	..	..	..	..	..	1
Sudbury	..	..	..	..	..	2
						— 3
						— 658."

On learning the result of this Division, the Anti-Maynooth Committee immediately published the following Advertisement :—

#### "ENDOWMENT OF POPERY.

#### "THE MAYNOOTH BILL—IMPORTANT.

"Central Anti-Maynooth Committee Room,

"Crown and Anchor Tavern,

"22nd May, 1845.

"The Central Anti-Maynooth Committee are anxious, at this important juncture, to impress upon the minds of their Protestant fellow-subjects, the urgent necessity of continued and vigorous efforts against the Maynooth Endowment Bill, which has now unhappily received the final sanction of the House of Commons. They earnestly desire, that Petitions to the House of Lords should be forwarded, without a single hour's avoidable delay, from all the localities, congregations, and bodies, from which they have not hitherto been sent. They also call upon the Anti-Maynooth Committees in the Country, Ministers of all Evangelical denominations, and the friends of Protestantism generally, to hold themselves in readiness for the *immediate* and energetic adoption of such ulterior measures as may be resolved upon at this fearful emergency of our National affairs.

"CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman.*

"JAMES LORD, *Secretary.*"

The following Resolutions were also passed by the Committee, on the 23rd of May—

“1. Resolved, that, in the present crisis of our national affairs,—the Bill for the Endowment of Maynooth College having passed the House of Commons,—it is the bounden duty of Protestants to address the Queen, and to state to her Majesty the strong and irreconcilable objection which the vast majority of the people of this Country entertain against that Measure; and that they are of opinion, that so new a principle as that of the Endowment of Popery by this Protestant Country, ought not to be acted upon, without first taking the sense of the entire Constituencies of the United Kingdom; and that Her Majesty be, therefore, requested to withhold her assent, till such an appeal be made to the people.

“2. Resolved, that it appears to this Committee of the utmost importance, in the present eventful crisis, that those Archbishops and Bishops of the Established Church who are opposed to the proposed Endowment of Maynooth, should give the earliest possible intimation to the Country, in their places in the House of Lords, of their opposition,—whether on the presentation of Petitions, or in Debate.

“A public, distinct, and firm statement of such opposition, on the part of each Bishop who is opposed to the Measure, would tend greatly to strengthen and encourage many Members—both Clerical and Lay—of the Established Church, in their respective Dioceses, in their hostility to the Measure. It would also refute the gross misrepresentations which certain persons have attempted to impose upon the Country, that the opposition to this advance of Romanism is confined chiefly to Dissenters. A Christian testimony, so delivered, would present the Episcopal Bench in an especially favourable point of view to the whole Body of Protestants, whether Churchman or Nonconformist. All Catholic Christians would rejoice to see the Bishops employing, in such a manner, their talents, their influence, and their character, in the peculiar place which they at present occupy in the British Constitution, in conformity with that testimony.”

A few days afterwards, the following Circular was issued, on the first introduction of the Bill into the House of Lords:—

#### “THE MAYNOOTH ENDOWMENT BILL.

“Central Anti-Maynooth Committee,  
“Crown and Anchor, Strand, London, May 26th, 1845

“Dear Sir,

“The Maynooth Bill has now passed the House of Commons, and has been read once in the House of Lords.

“For the first time since the Reformation, our Representatives have consented to a permanent connexion between the State and Popery, and to the name of England being withdrawn, as that of Geneva had been before withdrawn, from the list of Nations protesting against Rome.

“If the House of Lords, and the Crown, should adopt the Maynooth Bill, all the great powers of Europe will be in the situation of conniving at Popery. The last great exception to this fearful dereliction of duty among Protestant Nations will have ceased.

“Let us strain every nerve to avert this consummation!

“We have petitioned the Commons in vain. Our Representatives have, with a

few honourable exceptions, remained uninfluenced by 8,922 petitions, signed by 1,121,470 persons.\*

"We hope that, in accordance with our original request, and with several subsequent intimations, our friends who have addressed the Commons, will also petition the Lords, without delay. It is due to that august assembly, that they should be sustained by public opinion, in rejecting a Measure, which, if passed, will probably bring them, after the next Dissolution of Parliament, into painful collision with a Protestant House of Commons. It is especially due to the Spiritual Peers, that they should be informed of the strength of the public sentiment, and of the expectations which are suspended on their fidelity to the cause of Protestant Truth. But it is to our gracious Sovereign, as it seems to us, that our entreaties should now be chiefly addressed.

"It might not be advisable to petition the Queen, absolutely to reject a Measure which the two Houses of Parliament should have approved. Nor would it be fit to ask Her Majesty, to dismiss her Ministers, and to change her policy, without proof of the almost unanimous feeling of the Country. That proof can only be afforded at the hustings. To the hustings,—to the people,—as the last Constitutional appeal upon matters of momentous National interest, it seems to us, that the question now agitating the Country ought to be referred. We have no doubt what the people's decision would be; and we think that, before Her Majesty consents to the passing of any Law which amounts to a Revolution, and which (rightly or wrongly) changes the British Constitution, Her Ministers are bound to let the voice of the Nation be constitutionally heard.

"We, therefore, beg to submit to your consideration, the propriety of addressing the Queen to dissolve Parliament, in such form as you may approve; and we enclose a copy of a Memorial to Her Majesty, which will be proposed for adoption in the Metropolis.† Upon mature consideration, we have determined not to convene a second Conference in London. It seems to us, that the effort and expense which would be necessary in convening such an assembly, would be better employed in holding local meetings to promote Addresses to Her Majesty. We beg to suggest, that, if it be thought right to do more than assemble the inhabitants of each town or city, it might be well to bring together the Protestants from large districts, either to the County towns, or to populous places, like Manchester, Leeds, and Glasgow.

"Addresses from Town Councils and other Corporate Bodies, especially such as have the constitutional right of approaching Her Majesty's person, are particularly desirable. Should you determine to address the Queen, your Memorial should be neatly engrossed on parchment, or strong paper, and forwarded to London, if possible, by Wednesday, the 4th June. Memorials entrusted to this Committee, post paid, will be duly presented; but it is most advisable, that petitioners should request some Peer, resident in their own neighbourhood, to present their Petition, and to seek

\* This is exclusive of those presented between the last previous return, 16th of May, and the Third Reading of the Bill.

† This Memorial afterwards underwent some modifications; and, in the form in which it was finally adopted and presented to Her Majesty, it will be found in a subsequent page, in the Report of the proceedings of the Meeting at Exeter Hall, on June 4th. It was adopted, nearly as it stood originally, by the Anti-Maynooth Conference at Dublin; and as published by them, will be found in the account of their proceedings.



for that purpose a personal interview with Her Majesty. We request you to inform our Secretary, by separate letter, of the name of the place and County from which your Address has been sent, and the number of signatures. On the earliest day which may be practicable, we propose to hold in London an aggregate Meeting of Protestants to adopt an address to the Queen. Without at all pressing the attendance of our Country friends, we shall be happy to see any of them on that occasion, which may perhaps become memorable in after times.

"We are far from being without hope, that the mind of the Queen may be influenced by the proposed appeal. An ancestor of Her Royal Consort, the first Protestant prince in Europe, was the patron of Luther; and Her Majesty will not lightly renounce the privilege of being, what the Elector of Saxony thought it his greatest honour to become—a 'Protesting' Sovereign. Great will be the responsibility of any Minister who shall advise Her Majesty to adopt a course, so directly opposed to the feelings of the Nation, and to the principles which placed her family on the Throne. After all, however, it is not to results, but to duty, that we must look. Duty is ours—events are with God. Let us strive so to demean ourselves in the present thrilling crisis of the history of our Country and of the world,—let the Catholic Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ so rally around the ark of Divine truth, that we may confidently hope for the blessing of Almighty God upon our proceedings.

"Signed, on behalf of the Committee,

"CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, *Chairman.*

"JAMES LORD, *Secretary.*"

Meanwhile, it was deemed highly important to the Cause, that a Deputation from the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, in London, should proceed to Dublin, to be present at a great Meeting of their Protestant Brethren in that City. Accordingly, Sir Culling Eardley Smith, the Rev. Dr. Holloway, the Rev. John Blackburn, and the Rev. Charles Prest, were requested by the Committee to undertake that office.

They left London, for that purpose, on Monday, May 26,—expecting that the Meeting in Dublin would take place on the Wednesday following. On their arrival in Dublin, however, they found that this Meeting had been postponed till the Wednesday in the following week; and letters, announcing this, arrived in London, a few hours after they had left. They considered this circumstance as providential, and were only desirous of improving, to the utmost, the opportunity of usefulness which the delay afforded them. Dr. Holloway and Mr. Prest, therefore, remained in Dublin, to assist the Committee there, in making their arrangements for an Anti-Maynooth Conference of Irish Protestants of all Denominations in Dublin; and Sir C. E. Smith and Mr. Blackburn proceeded to Belfast, where they were most cordially received. They attended a large Conference in Belfast on Monday morning, June 2nd, and two public Meetings, which were both held in the evening of that day, attended, it is calculated, by nearly 5,000 persons. These Meetings served fully to attest the decided opposition of the Protestants of the North of Ireland to the proposed Endowment of Maynooth, and effect-

ually refuted some assertions which had been made in the House of Commons on that subject.

The following day they returned to Dublin ; and on Wednesday, June 4th, the Irish Anti-Maynooth Conference assembled—of which the following account is extracted from the Dublin “Statesman.” The opening Speech of the Chairman, and that of Dr. Blackwood, will serve so fully to explain the Principles and Plan upon which that Conference was convened and conducted, and to illustrate the spirit which pervaded it, as to preclude the necessity of any remarks which could be made by one, who had not the privilege of being present.

#### “ANTI-MAYNOOTH MOVEMENT IN IRELAND.

##### *“First Great Anti-Maynooth Conference of Protestants of all Denominations.*

“The first great National demonstration of the real state of Protestant feeling, so much misunderstood and misrepresented by Sir Robert Peel, began on Wednesday morning, under circumstances of a most cheering character. At nine o’clock, a portion of the members of the Conference, composed of Clergymen, Ministers, and members of all Denominations of Protestants, met together to breakfast in the Long Room of the Rotunda, to the number of about 300, and proceeded afterwards to the Pillar Room, which was prepared for their reception, to enter upon the business of the day. The immediate point proposed was, to refute Sir Robert Peel’s assertion, and to prove, that all classes of the Protestants of Ireland are decidedly hostile to the project of endowing the Roman Catholic Church ; and, in particular, are entirely adverse to the Bill for endowing the College of Maynooth. The further object of the Conference and Meetings, is, to lay the foundation of a closer union and organization of the Protestants of England, Ireland, and Scotland ; and, perhaps, to establish connexion with those of other European Countries, and with America. The great principle of forbearance on all secondary matters, while uniting in the one great object, in order to prevent the expression of any repugnant sentiment, was printed on the back of the admission tickets, by acceptance of which the parties were bound to keep to the point.”

Then follows a long list of Clergymen, including several Dignitaries of the Church, Independent, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Wesleyan Ministers and Laymen, of high respectability.

“At Ten o’clock precisely, upon the motion of the Very Rev. the Dean of Ardagh, seconded by Colonel Talbot, the Chair was taken by the Hon. Somerset R. Maxwell.

“Thomas H. Thompson, Esq., and the Rev. Josiah Crampton, the Secretaries of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee for Ireland, were in attendance, and acted in the same capacity to the Conference.

“The proceedings having been opened with prayer by the Very Rev. the Dean of Ardagh,

“The Hon. Chairman came forward to address the assembly, and was received with great applause. When silence was obtained, he said, that he had not the least expectation, on entering the room, that he should be called upon to take any prominent part in the proceedings of the day, much less to fill the responsible situation which he then occupied. He would candidly confess, that, were the Meeting merely of a political character, layman as he was, he could not, with his sentiments, have responded to the call ; but he considered the movement against Sir Robert Peel’s

policy on the subject of Maynooth to be eminently of a Religious nature. The question at issue was not the ascendancy of one Party over another ; it was no party struggle. The conflicting elements were Truth and Error—light and darkness ; the contending parties, God and His servants, and Satan and his servants. (Hear, hear.) They were assembled, to maintain the supremacy of God's word—the Bible ; and its sufficiency to guide and to save man, was the grand point round which they were met to rally. (Applause.) A solemn prayer to God had just been offered, for union among all who loved their Bible, in their opposition to the Ministerial patronage of Popery. It was God who 'made men to be of one mind in one house ;' and he felt, that God's hand might be thus recognized in what had elsewhere taken place, in the unanimity which pervaded all Denominations of Protestants on the all-important subject now under discussion. Such unanimity, he had every confidence, would characterize their proceedings that day. (Loud cheers.) There was not a more sincere lover of the Church Establishment present than himself ; and in the presence of Dissenters he would say, that he considered that it had been the most eminent instrument for the promotion of God's Truth that this World had ever seen ; but he by no means considered its preservation essential to the existence of true spiritual Religion among us. (Hear, and cheers.) He rejoiced to think, that he had ascended a platform on which stood, not only members of his own Church, but also an extensive Deputation from England, of influential members of various Dissenting Congregations. (Hear, hear.) He trusted that, whatever differences existed among them on minor points, these would all be merged in one common condemnation of the policy of Ministers—in one common desire to uphold the honour of the Word of God. (Loud cheers.) In taking the Chair, he fully expected a disclaimer from the Dissenting Gentlemen present, of the objectionable sentiments put forth, through Mr. Burnet, by the English Dissenters at Crosby Hall. (Loud cheers.) In his opinion, the Country was never in greater danger than at present. We are rejecting God ; and if we did not, as a Nation, repent, God would reject us. (Cheers.) He would adduce an awful passage from Scripture, which he deemed equally applicable to Britain as to Israel. In 2 Chronicles, chap. xxxvi. 16, he found, that the sin, for which God had sent into captivity His ancient people, was identical with that which now lay like an incubus on the Councils of our Nation. 'They mocked the messengers of God, and despised His words, and misused His prophets, until the wrath of the Lord arose against his people, till there was no remedy.' Notwithstanding the boasted commercial prosperity of Britain, if her Rulers persevered in their policy, she might apply that awful curse to herself, 'As the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossom shall go up as dust.' And why, he would ask ? Let this reason be marked—'Because they have cast away the law of the Lord, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.'—Isaiah v. 24. He would make no apology for thus producing his Bible. Its appearance became the object and character of their Meeting. (Loud cheers.) From its sacred pages he would draw one more passage, too strikingly applicable to be omitted. Thyatira was a flourishing Church, yet one cause of complaint is adduced against it :—'I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and seduce my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed unto idols.'—Rev. ii. 20. Who could not but read in this typical Jezebel, the patronized Popery of the present day ? But, thank God, the Church (and he did not mean the Establishment, but all who loved the Lord,) was, by its present Anti-Maynooth operations, freeing itself of the charge thus brought against that ancient Church.

"The Hon. Gentleman then said, that he would call upon the Chairman of the Irish Anti-Maynooth Committee, to state some important matters to the Meeting.

"James S. Blackwood, Esq., LL.D., Chairman of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, then said, that he had been prepared to make a few general observations upon the interesting nature of the occasion which had brought them together this day, yet, as this part of the subject had been so well treated of in the beautiful opening address of their Honourable and excellent Chairman, he should not trespass on the valuable time of so important an assembly, but, with one or two remarks, proceed to the subject of the business of the day: and first, as to the construction of the Anti-Maynooth Committee, he would observe, that it originated in a great public Meeting, held in the Rotunda, on the introduction of the Maynooth Bill into the House of Commons; the Movers and Seconders of Resolutions at which Meeting, together with all Clergymen present, were, by a vote of the assembly, constituted into a Committee to resist the progress of the Measure. When the Anti-Maynooth Conference was summoned in London, the Dublin Committee sent a Deputation to England, of which he had the honour to be one. There,—it being observed by him, that the platform of the Anti-Maynooth Committee was much broader, and embraced Clergymen, and Ministers, and laymen of all Denominations of Protestants,—it immediately occurred, that it was perfectly practicable, as well as necessary to the success of the prime object of the movement, to extend and widen the platform *here*; which was accordingly done; and the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee of Ireland now constituted an united phalanx of Clergy, and laymen, and Ministers of all Protestant Denominations—in a word, it was a perfect representation of the entire body of the Protestantism of the land. Before proceeding to state the order of the proceedings of the day, there were just one or two points he desired to notice, which had been only partially, if at all, referred to by their Honourable Chairman, who had not been aware of the nature and detail of the proceedings of the Committee. And at this point, he could not but mention, what he was sure the Meeting would agree with him in expressing, how much they were indebted to the kind and Christian spirit of their generous Chairman, who, on a moment's notice, and against his previous inclination, at once acceded to the request to occupy the Chair this morning, though wholly unacquainted with the details of the proceedings, and not in good health. (Applause.) The next point he wished to advert to was, the nature of the present union, as it was announced in Resolutions of the Committees, and printed on the back of the tickets of admission,—both to this Conference and to the great Meeting to be held on the following day. It was particularly to be noted, that no gentleman was to be understood as compromising one jot or tittle of any opinion or conviction, political, or ecclesiastical, or doctrinal. These he was to be understood as still holding, in his own mind and conscience, in their integrity,—notwithstanding his appearance on that platform with gentlemen of wholly opposite opinions; but, for this occasion and on this question, he was expected not to intrude any peculiar views, but simply to adhere to the terms of organization adopted, which were, to unite for the defence of the Truth as it is in Jesus, and to oppose all Endowment of the Church of Rome, but, in particular, this Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth. The next topic to which he would slightly advert was the opinion which Mr. O'Connell had taken upon himself to give in the Repeal Association last Monday. That Honourable and learned Gentleman had advised them, that their proceedings were illegal—perhaps he meant it kindly. (A laugh.) But he was certainly mistaken in his view of the Convention Act, if he really supposed their proceedings to be a violation of it. At the very commencement, however, of this movement, and before the Conference was summoned, that Act

had suggested itself to his own mind, but, on considering its provisions, it appeared so clear to him, that it did not at all apply to them. \* \* \* Taking the preamble of the Act, as to the nature of conventions intended to be forbidden, together with the enacting clauses, it was perfectly clear, that this Conference was entirely out of its operation; since they were neither disloyal nor seditious persons, pretending to represent the people in derogation of Parliament,—and, more particularly, since they were assembled, not to seek the repeal of any matter established by Law, but to prevent an alteration of the Law of the land, and the establishment of a new principle. In justice to Mr. O'Connell, however, he would repeat, that, whatever might have been the learned Gentleman's motive in alluding to the subject, he entirely acquitted him of intending any unkindness to them. \* \* \* And, if he might take the liberty of making the suggestion to that Conference, no unkindly feeling would be expressed in that room towards Mr. O'Connell,—or, indeed, entertained in their breasts, by reason of remarks which might be fairly enough attributed to a legitimate political motive. (Hear, hear.) The other subject, which had been partially alluded to by the Chairman, required a very few observations—he meant, the letter of the Ultra-Voluntary Dissenters, lately assembled in Crosby Hall, which had appeared in the papers, signed by Mr. John Burnet, and which was of an improper character. That document had been very much misunderstood by a portion of the public,—as if it represented the opinions of the Voluntaries who had been joined in the proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference. He trusted Sir Culling Smith, or Mr. Blackburn, would make this matter clear,—since it had produced some confusion in the public mind. He had heard of letters from Clergymen of the Church of England, who pointed to the document from Crosby Hall, as a proof, that the Anti-Maynooth Committee had failed, and that union between the Voluntaries and those who held the Establishment Principle was impossible. (Hear, and cheers.) Now, the fact was, that on the Anti-Maynooth Committee of England, there were gentlemen, who held the Voluntary Principle as firmly as the Delegates of Crosby Hall; but whose Christianity being stronger than their Voluntarism, enabled them to sink, for the present, that secondary question altogether, and to join in contending for the Truth, and against the Endowment of Error. He would now conclude, by briefly stating the proposed order of proceedings of the day. First, the London Deputation would be introduced, and state matters interesting to the Conference; then the Deputations from places in Ireland, in the order of their importance, or as their mechanical arrangements might permit, would be called on severally to describe the state of feeling as to the Maynooth Bill in their neighbourhoods; after which a Petition to the House of Lords, and an Address to the Queen, would be proposed; and about three o'clock, the Conference would adjourn to six in the evening."

Sir Culling E. Smith and Mr. Blackburn, having been thus appealed to by the Chairman and Dr. Blackwood, concurred in assuring the Meeting that "Crosby Hall did not represent the feelings of the Dissenters of England."

#### "THE GREAT ANTI-MAYNOOTH MEETING AT THE ROTUNDA.

"The solemn and beautiful Conference of Wednesday, was speedily followed by the more exciting demonstration of the great aggregate Public Meeting of the Deputies of all Protestant Denominations from the Country, and other friends of the cause, held in the Round Room of the Rotunda, on Thursday, the 5th of June, 1845—a day ever memorable in the annals of the Protestant Church. The most sanguine expectations of the Central Committee were fully equalled, if not surpassed.

After the session on the day before, from nine o'clock in the morning until half-past ten at night, it was scarcely to be expected, that the Committee and Officers and Deputations would be very early on the platform. Nevertheless they were at their post shortly after ten o'clock in the morning; and by eleven, the room was densely thronged,—one hour before the Chair was taken,—as well on the platform as in the body of the Meeting, where many holders even of platform tickets thought themselves fortunate if they could find a place. The array of Dignitaries and Clergy of piety and distinction, mingled on the platform with the Ministers of every other Protestant Denomination, was a sight wholly unexampled in this Country. Churchmen, Moravians, Presbyterians, Independents, Wesleyans, Primitive Wesleyans, Protestant Associations, were all there represented; and the union of Whigs and Conservatives proved, that all parties were united in the bond of the Protestant Religion, throwing political distinctions and prejudices on all hands to the winds, in defence of the Protestant faith.

“The following necessarily imperfect list of those upon and around the platform will give some idea of the array, on this occasion, of those who represented the feeling of Irish Protestantism as to the Ministerial policy of endowing the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth.”

This list occupies two-thirds of a column of the Dublin “Statesman,” very closely printed.

“There were none but gentlemen admitted to the meeting, and some idea may be entertained of the assemblage which thronged the room, from the fact, that the Petition, which was lying for signature at the door, had no less than 3,627 names added to it, exclusive of those present who had previously signed it. It may, therefore, not be considered an exaggerated statement to say, that at least 5,000 individuals attended the Meeting during the day, between its opening at twelve o'clock and its close at eight last evening.

“The Chair was then taken by the Hon. S. R. Maxwell amid loud cheers.

“The letters alluded to by J. S. Blackwood, Esq., Chairman of the Committee, as having been received, expressing entire sympathy with the movement, and enclosing, either statement of Petitions or contributions to the funds, amount to several hundreds, and constitute an interesting record. It was, however, found impracticable to present any analysis of their contents, many of which were of great interest. It was also found necessary to suppress all mention of a very great number of them, which coming from dangerous districts, it would expose the writers to peril if their names were given.”

The following Advertisement of the Resolutions, with the names of the Movers and Seconders, as published in the Dublin Newspapers, will sufficiently indicate the nature of the proceedings, both at the Conference, and at the Meeting. It is due to the Protestants of Ireland to record them.

#### “ANTI-MAYNOOTH CONFERENCE AND MEETING.

“At a Conference of Ministers and Members of all Denominations of Protestants, met in the Pillar Room of the Rotunda in Dublin, on Wednesday, the 4th of June, 1845, to oppose the Bill for the Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

“Moved by Stepney St. George, Esq., J.P., county Galway; seconded by William Blackwood, Esq., J.P., county Down.

“Resolved—That the Petition to the House of Lords, approved of by the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee for Ireland, and now read, be adopted by this Meeting, and left for signature in charge of the Committee.

“To the Right Reverend and Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled.

“The humble petition of a numerous body of Protestants of all Denominations, met in Dublin, to oppose the Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth,

“Humbly Showeth—That your petitioners regard with disapprobation and alarm the Bill now before your Right Honourable House for the permanent Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth.

“That, without entering into the important question as to the right or duty of the State to employ national funds in the maintenance of true Religion, your petitioners entirely concur in disapproving of the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Religion in any form; and, as their objections are founded on principles drawn from the Word of God, they are not likely to be removed or mitigated.

“That many of the doctrines held by the Church of Rome, never authoritatively disclaimed, and confessedly taught in the College of Maynooth, are plainly inconsistent with the Word of God; while many of the practices authoritatively inculcated, and observed in that Church, are idolatrous and superstitious; and that, therefore, no assistance ought to be given out of the National resources, to train a body of men for the purpose of propagating and extending such doctrines and practices.

“That for these and other reasons, your petitioners pray your Right Honourable House, that the Bill for the Endowment of the College of Maynooth may not pass into a Law, and your petitioners will ever pray.’

“Moved by Hyacinth D’Arcy, Esq., J.P., Clifden Castle, county Galway; seconded by Captain Shirley Ball—

“Resolved—That whereas the present Parliament is now verging to the fifth year of its existence, and 10,075 Petitions against the Endowment of Maynooth, bearing 1,282,201 signatures, have been presented to the House of Commons, without procuring that attention to the Religious convictions of Protestants which they ought, in justice, to have commanded; and whereas, in the judgment of this Meeting, the proposed Bill for the Endowment of Maynooth involves a National departure from the Religious principles of the British Constitution; it is therefore resolved, that the Memorial to Her Most Gracious Majesty, praying her to permit the voice of the Nation to be constitutionally heard, which has been approved of by the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee for Ireland, and now read, be adopted and signed by this Meeting; and that the Earl of Roden be requested to convey the same to the hands of Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen.

“To the Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty.

“Most Gracious Sovereign,

“We, your Majesty’s most dutiful and loyal subjects, being Protestant inhabitants of Ireland, in approaching the footstool of your Throne, humbly beg leave to express our unshaken fidelity and attachment to your Majesty’s Royal person and family, and our firm adherence to those Protestant principles which placed the illustrious ancestors of your Majesty on the throne of these Realms.

“Alarmed, as we now are, for the security of our Religion and liberty, we gratefully revert to the encouraging declaration of your Majesty on your happy accession to the Crown, that you ‘had learned from your infancy to respect and love the Consti-

tution of your native Country,' and that your Majesty 'would make it your unceasing study to maintain the Reformed Religion as by law established, securing, at the same time, to all, the full enjoyment of Religious Liberty.'

" 'That Constitution, as your Majesty well knows, assumes the existence of a community of interests, and a sympathy in judgment and in feeling, between those who legislate for the people and the people for whom they legislate; but we are grieved to state to your Majesty, that the present Representatives of the Commons of the United Kingdom have passed a Bill for the permanent Endowment of the College of Maynooth for the training Romish priests; and this they have done, confessedly, in opposition to the Religious convictions of the people, as respectfully declared in the Petitions signed by your Majesty's loyal and devoted subjects.

" 'The Bill, besides providing for the maintenance and education from the public revenue of 520 students in Romish doctrines, provides also that the president, vice-president, officers, and professors of that College, who teach the doctrines and discipline of the Church of Rome, shall become the recognized servants of the Crown and permanent stipendiaries of the State;—a measure which, in our most deliberate and solemn judgment, essentially changes the British Constitution, tends to undermine the foundation of the Throne, and endanger the free profession of the Protestant faith.

" 'We beg most humbly, yet most emphatically, to assure your Majesty that our opposition to this Measure does not arise from a wish to deprive any of our fellow-subjects of their rightful privileges as citizens; but from an unconquerable repugnance to the employment of the revenues of this Protestant Country for the support and propagation of doctrines and practices, which we firmly believe to be, what your Majesty has solemnly declared them to be, 'superstitious and idolatrous.'

" 'We feel it, therefore, to be our bounden duty to God and to your Majesty, most humbly and urgently to implore your Majesty to withhold your Royal Assent from any such Bill, until your Majesty shall, by the Dissolution of Parliament, have granted to your loyal people the opportunity of pronouncing their deliberate judgment upon such a momentous change in the fundamental principles of the British Constitution.

" 'And your memorialists will ever pray, &c.

" 'SOMERSET RICHARD MAXWELL, *Chairman of Conference.*

" 'J. S. BLACKWOOD, LL.D., *Chairman of Committee.*

" 'JOSIAH CRAMPTON, Clerk, } *Secretaries.*  
 " 'THOMAS H. THOMPSON, }

#### " PROTESTANT MEETING.

" At a great Protestant Meeting of Deputations of the Protestants of all Denominations from the Country, and others, held in the Round Room of the Rotunda on Thursday, the 5th June, 1845, the following Resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

" Moved by the Very Rev. the Dean of Ardagh; seconded by the Rev. J. Blackburn, Independent minister, London; supported by the Rev. Dr. Holloway, London:

" Resolved—That this Meeting desire to rejoice, and to record their gratitude to Almighty God, not only for His manifold distinguished blessings in times past, vouchsafed to these United Protestant Kingdoms,—but also for the signal spirit of zeal and union, and brotherly forbearing of one another in love, hitherto evinced by the brethren in Great Britain and throughout this Country, who, upon the principles



of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committees, both of England and Ireland, are united with us in a conscientious opposition to the Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth.

“Moved by the Venerable the Archdeacon of Kilmacduagh; seconded by the Rev. Thomas Waugh, Wesleyan Minister, Bandon; supported by the Rev. W. Urwick, D.D., Independent Minister, Dublin:

“Resolved—That this Meeting, composed of Protestants of various Denominations, and of Deputies from all parts of Ireland, hereby express and record their conscientious and determined opposition to the Bill for endowing the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth now before Parliament.

“Moved by Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart.; seconded by the Rev. W. B. Kirkpatrick, Presbyterian Minister, Dublin; supported by Rev. T. D. Gregg, Chaplain of St. Nicholas Within:

“Resolved—That, whilst earnestly deprecating the proposed Bill for the Endowment of Maynooth, this Meeting sincerely disclaims all feelings of hostility to our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen; we desire for them the blessings of true Religion; we cannot consent to be parties in riveting upon them a system which we know to be false; and we authorize an Address to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, founded on this Resolution, to be forthwith prepared by the Committee, now sitting in Dublin, and circulated at their discretion.

“Moved by the Rev. Chas. Prest, Wesleyan Minister, London; seconded by the Rev. Chas. Fleury, Chaplain of the Molyneux Asylum, Dublin, supported by the Rev. W. H. Cooper, Independent Minister, Dublin:

[This Resolution and the Petition are the same as the first above, adopted at the Conference on Wednesday.]

“Moved by Robert Ward, Esq., D.L., Bangor Castle, county Down; seconded by Joseph Napier, Esq., Q.C., Mountjoy-square:

[This Resolution and the Address are the same as the second above, adopted at the Conference previously.]

“Moved by the Rev. John Drought, Glenely; seconded by the Rev. H. E. Prior, Lucan:

“Resolved—That, as considerable expense has been necessarily incurred by the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee for Ireland, this Meeting pledges itself to contribute to the funds of the Committee, and to promote subscriptions for the same object among their friends; and the more so, as this Meeting contemplates, not merely transient action, but continued effort; for which purpose it is resolved, that the Committee, with power to add to their number, do continue their organization.

“Moved by the Rev. R. H. Maunsell Eyre, Monkstown; seconded by the Rev. John Weir, Presbyterian Minister, Belfast:

“Resolved—That the cordial thanks of this Meeting be presented to Sir Culling Eardley Smith, the Rev. Dr. Holloway, the Rev. Charles Prest, and the Rev. John Blackburn—the gentlemen composing the Deputation from England, as well for their zealous and able services in the sister Country, as for their ready response to the invitation of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee for Ireland, and also for the extraordinary zeal, courtesy, and cordial kindness evinced by those gentlemen, since their arrival in this Country, in compliance with that invitation.

“Moved by the Rev. Thos. Acton, Chaplain of St. George's; seconded by the Rev. Thos. Moriarty, Dingle:

“Resolved—That this Meeting entertains the confident hope, that, under the good providence of God, increased union and brotherly love amongst Protestants

of all Denominations shall be the result of the present proceedings; and that the Deputies, on returning to their several localities, will labour to extend the spirit and principles of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committees of England and of Ireland, with a view to some more permanent organization.

“ SOMERSET RICHARD MAXWELL, *Chairman*.

“ Moved by the Rev. Wm. Waller, of Castletown, county Limerick; seconded by J. D. R. Cleland, Esq., D.L., J.P., county Down:

“ Resolved—That the cordial thanks of this Meeting be presented to the Hon. Somerset Richard Maxwell, for his kind and able services in the Chair on this solemn occasion.

“ ROBERT WARD, *Chairman*.

“ JOSIAH CRAMPTON, Clk. } *Secretaries.*”

“ THOMAS H. THOMPSON, }

#### “ MAYNOOTH.

“ At a Meeting of Electors of Trinity College, held at Archdeacon Magee’s residence, 9, Upper Buckingham-street, on Saturday, 7th of June,

“ It was Resolved to petition her Majesty to dissolve Parliament before affixing her Royal signature to the Bill for the Endowment of Maynooth.

“ The Petition lies for signature at the *Evening Mail* Office; Curry and Co., Sackville-street; and Hardy and Son, 23, Upper Sackville-street.

(Signed on behalf of the Meeting.)

“ THOMAS PURCELL MAGEE, LL.D., *Chairman*.

“ W. C. MAGEE, A.B. and Ex-Schol., *Secretary*.

#### “ CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE FOR IRELAND.

“ 5, College-street, Dublin, 6th June, 1845.

“ The Committee would earnestly urge upon the Clergy and Ministers of various Denominations throughout Ireland the importance of preparing and transmitting, without loss of time, Addresses to her Majesty the Queen, not to give her Royal assent to the Maynooth Endowment Bill without a previous Dissolution of the Parliament. They would suggest the following as a convenient form of Address, and, where practicable, to have it signed unitedly. It should purport to be from ‘Protestants of various Denominations.’

#### “ TO THE QUEEN’S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

“ We, your Majesty’s most dutiful and loyal subjects, being Protestant inhabitants of ———, viewing with deep anxiety the Bill now passing through Parliament for the Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, and believing the permanent Establishment of that Institution to be fraught with danger to the best interests of your Majesty’s Empire, most humbly and urgently implore your Majesty to withhold your Royal assent from any such Bill, until your Majesty shall, by the Dissolution of Parliament, have granted to your loyal people the opportunity of pronouncing their deliberate judgment on the proposed measure.

“ J. S. BLACKWOOD, LL.D., *Chairman*.

“ JOSIAH CRAMPTON, Clerk, } *Secretaries.*

“ THOMAS H. THOMPSON, }

“ N.B.—The Address may be transmitted for presentation, enclosed to ‘The Home Secretary, London,’ open at the ends, free of postage; but if it be thought more desirable that it should be presented by a Peer, it must be directed to his address, and post-paid.”

The leading Article in "The Statesman," of Monday, June 9th, makes the following remarks upon this great Protestant Demonstration:—

**"WE ARE FIGHTING ANEW THE BATTLE OF THE REFORMATION—  
*Anti-Maynooth Committee.***

"To comment at large upon the demonstration of the real state of the case afforded in our columns, as regards the feelings of Protestant Ireland in the matter of the Endowment of Maynooth, would be entirely impertinent. If evidence have any weight, or if proof be really desired, her Majesty's Government are now empowered to advise their Sovereign, that the heart of the Protestantism of Ireland entreats her not to affix the royal sign-manual to this Bill of curse, without giving her loyal subjects an opportunity, by the Dissolution of Parliament, to declare, practically and powerfully, their final sentiments on the fatal Measure. Who can read over the successive simple statements of the Ministers and Gentlemen of all Denominations of Protestants in the Conference of Wednesday, and not see at once, how unanimous are the Protestants of Ireland on this all-engrossing subject? If supplementary evidence be wanting, it is found in the list of the names of the Gentlemen on the platforms of both days, and in the very imperfect selection of the names of those persons, from whom letters were received by the Committee, from all parts of Ireland, of which there has not been time to make any analysis approaching to completeness; and the list of donations to the funds of the Anti-Maynooth Committee affords, though last, not perhaps the least, item of the proof, that Sir R. Peel was entirely in error, when he declared Ireland to be acquiescent in his abominable policy. Who ever saw before now, such an united phalanx of opposition from Irish Protestants to any Government measure; and more especially to any measure of this Administration? Who ever heard before now, such an united voice from all corners of the land, and from all the unhappily too often divided hosts of the Protestant Reformation, now combined against a particular measure of Government? Not a body in Ireland of true Christian Protestants, of any Denomination, have failed to testify in this matter. Here, beside the appearance of the Dignitaries and Clergy of the Established Church of Ireland, we find Presbyterians and Moravians, Wesleyans and Independents, Primitive Wesleyans, and Covenanters, and Baptists, and Operative Protestant Associations, joining with Nobles and Gentry, in upholding the pure Truth of the Protestant Reformation, and virtually denouncing the apostasy of the Ministry of Peel. Let any man of candid mind, we repeat, just simply look at the names and designations of the Movers and Seconders of the Resolutions, and of those who spoke in the Conference, or who are to be found in the list of contributions; and he will see an array of Protestant feeling, from east and west, and north and south of Ireland, which gives contradiction direct and plump to Sir R. Peel's mis-statements, and affords an earnest of future good to the Church of Christ,—if the same spirit of love, and union, and forbearance, and activity, be brought now to the aid of the future movements to organize Protestantism, which ought to be at once taken into earnest consideration.

"And this leads us to pass from the first branch of our subject, and the first object of the late demonstration,—which was, to disprove Sir Robert Peel's assertion respecting the apathy of Protestant Ireland. Our second object is, to carry on the union of Protestants, and to prepare for some future, though not distant, efforts. It is perfectly plain, that necessity is now upon us to do so. It is perfectly plain, that Romish ascendancy and persecution are at the door, unless we bestir

and unite. It appears to us, that Committees ought to be formed throughout the land, to prepare the way for coming efforts.\* Funds ought to be raised and transmitted to the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, whose energetic proceedings have been attended with inevitable and heavy expense. We trust our friends will bear in mind the Resolution passed at the great Meeting, by which they are pledged to stir their various localities in this behalf. We would suggest, that the different Denominations might easily make subscriptions of a small amount, which would come lightly on individual contributors, and ease the burden of the Central Committee.

"In conclusion, we would beg to request the attention of English readers especially to an article from the *Nation* on this Anti-Maynooth movement, which we have transferred to our columns.\* Our purpose in so doing was to give our English brethren some idea, of the light in which they are to view the reports in the Irish Romish and Repeal newspapers. Four intelligent Englishmen of rank, station, learning, and piety respectively, saw with their own eyes, and heard with their own ears, those things which we have imperfectly reported in our columns. Let those Gentlemen tell their fellow-countrymen what was the real state of facts. Let them point to the *Nation's* article; and declare to England the degree of trust to be placed, even in mere reports of facts from those sources. The very names of the Movers and Seconders of Resolutions, and of the occupants of the platform, might be enough; but let Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Dr. Holloway, Mr. Prest, and Mr. Blackburn, tell deluded England the rest. We contrast the *Nation's* description with one of a different tone from a Protestant journal.†

"As we desire this number to contain as perfect and lasting a report as possible of the entire matter, we give the following corrected list of the

#### CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE FOR IRELAND.

JAMES S. BLACKWOOD, LL.D., Chairman.

Acton, Rev. Thos., Assistant Chaplain, St. George's Chapel	Cooper, Rev. W. II., Independent Minister, Zion Chapel
Ball, Captain Shirley	Crampton, Rev. Josiah, Rector of Raheny
Banks, Charles, jun. Esq.	Crampton, Rev. John F. T., Rector of Aughrim
Barton, Rev. Richard, Rector, St. George's	Crawford, Major
Blackwood, James S., LL.D.	Deery, Rev. Henry, Wesleyan Minister
Bonsall, John Ousely, Esq.	Dill, Rev. R., Presbyterian Minister, Usher's-quay
Bury, Captain	Drought, Rev. John
Brooke, Rev. R. S., Kingstown	Drought, Rev. Thomas, Incumbent, Glenely
Caldwell, Rev. Joseph, Curate of New- castle, county Wicklow	Eyre, Rev. Robert H. Maunsell
Campbell, Rev. Andrew, Chaplain, Mariners' Church, Dublin	Faussett, Rev. William, Chaplain, Ma- rine School
Carson, William, Esq.	Floury, Rev. C. M., Chaplain, Molyneux Asylum
Collis, Maurice, Esq. M.D.	
Conolly, Rev. R. H. Curate, St. James's	

---

\* Alluding to an extract from that paper, which is not worthy of being here transcribed.

† *The Warder*, which fully agrees with and confirms the views of *The Statesman*.

- Finlay, Rev. John Wm., Corkagh House,  
county Dublin
- Gordon, Samuel, Esq.
- Greer, Rev. John, Wesleyan Minister
- Gregg, Rev. Tresham D., Chaplain of  
St. Nicholas Within
- Gregg, Rev. Thomas, Curate, St. Cath-  
erine's
- Halahan, Rev. H. R., Incumbent, St.  
Nicholas Without
- Hardy, Philip Dixon, Esq.
- Heather, Rev. Dawson D., Wesleyan  
Minister
- Hill, Lord George A.
- Hughes, Rev. John, Wesleyan Minister
- Hackett, Rev. J. W.
- Hort, Rev. C. J., Curate, St. Thomas's
- Kearney, Rev. Parnell N.
- Kingston, Rev. Thomas, Rector, St.  
James's
- Kingsmill, Henry, Esq.
- Kirkpatrick, Rev. W. B., Presbyterian  
Minister, Mary's-abbey
- Lees, Rev. Sir Harcourt, Bart.
- Luscombe, Rev. J. P.
- Magee, Archdeacon, Rector of St.  
Thomas's
- Magee, Rev. William, Rector of Dun-  
ganstown
- Magee, Rev. William, Curate of St.  
Thomas's
- M'Conchy, Rev. Wm., Vicar of Coolock
- M'Ghee, Rev. Robert J., Chaplain,  
Harold's-cross
- Marks, Rev. Edward, D.D., St. Patrick's  
Cathedral
- Massaroon, Rev. Robert, Wesleyan  
Minister
- Massy, Hon. John
- Montgomery, Rev. A. Johnstone, Beau-  
lieu
- Morrisson, Rev. S. Gideon, Independent  
Minister
- Mulloy, Rev. William J., Curate, St.  
Thomas's
- Nangle, Rev. Edward, Achill
- Neville, Rev. W. A. Curate, St. James's
- O'Meara, Rev. Eugene, Curate, St. Mark's
- Prior, Rev. Hugh E., Incumbent, Lucan
- Porter, William H., Esq.
- Scott, Rev. Thomas, Curate, St. Audoen's
- Simpson, Rev. S., Presbyterian Minister,  
Usher's-quay
- Singleton, Rev. Wm., Curate of Finglas
- Stanford, Rev. C. S., Prebendary, St.  
Michan's
- Thompson, Thomas H. Esq.
- Thwaites, John, Esq.
- Tibeaud, O. A. Esq.
- Urwick, Rev. W., D.D., Independent  
Minister, York-street Chapel
- Walker, Rev. Samuel A., Rector, Gallo
- Waugh, Rev. Thomas, Wesleyan Minister
- Wilson, Rev. Wm., Presbyterian Minister,  
D'Olier-street
- Wright, Edward, Esq. LL.D.
- Young, Rev. E., Wesleyan Minister,  
Stephen's-green

JOSIAH CRAMPTON, Clerk, } *Secretaries.*  
THOMAS H. THOMPSON, }

CHARLES BANKS, jun., *Treasurer.*"

English Protestants will now, it is earnestly hoped, understand what reliance is to be placed upon Sir Robert Peel's statements respecting the Protestants of Ireland. It may be true, that many were, for a time, discouraged from taking any active measure in opposition to his Bill: it may be well believed, that, in many parts of Ireland, no active measures could have been taken by Protestants but at the peril of their lives. But what were really the views and feelings of the Protestants of Ireland must now be manifest.

It is now time to return to London. The Second Reading of the Bill in the House of Lords was fixed for Monday, June 2nd, and in the

foresight of the probable event of that Discussion, the following Advertisement was published.

#### “ENDOWMENT OF MAYNOOTH.

“An Aggregate Meeting of Protestants will be held on Wednesday, June 4, in Exeter Hall, the Right Hon. the Earl of Winchilsea in the Chair, for the purpose of adopting a Memorial to the Queen, imploring Her Majesty to withhold her Royal assent from the Maynooth Endowment Bill, until Her Majesty shall, by a Dissolution of Parliament, have given to her loyal people the opportunity of pronouncing their deliberate judgment upon such a momentous change in the fundamental principles of the British Constitution. The Central Anti-Maynooth Committee earnestly call upon their Protestant brethren throughout the Country, to hold similar Meetings without delay, and, wherever it is possible, district Meetings in central and populous places.

“Tickets may be had of Mr. Nisbet, Berners-street, Oxford-street; Mr. Baisler, 124, Oxford-street; Messrs. Hatchard, Piccadilly; Mr. Dalton, 28, Cockspur-street; Protestant Association, 11, Exeter Hall; Messrs. Seeley, Fleet-street; Mr. Dinnis, Paternoster-row; Messrs. Jackson and Walford, St. Paul's Churchyard; Mr. Jackson, Islington-green; and Mr. Shaw, Southampton-row, Russell-square.

By order of the Committee,

“JOHN DEAN PAUL, *Vice-Chairman*.

“JAMES LORD, *Secretary*.

“Central Anti-Maynooth Committee-room,  
“Crown and Anchor, Strand, May 27th, 1845.”

At the same time, “A Statement of Facts, respecting the Instruction given to the Students for the Romish Priesthood, in the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth,” was drawn up by the Editor of this Volume, and sent round to every Member of the House of Lords, previous to the Discussion. Thus, in various ways, information and warning were given to “the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled, and to every one of their Lordships in particular.” If they, nevertheless, were determined to commit this National Sin, in spite of light and knowledge,—the Anti-Maynooth Committee may humbly trust, that *they* at least are clear. They did what in them lay, by public protest and Petitions, and by private information and warning, to avert this National evil.

The following brief account of the Discussion, which took place in the Upper House on this Measure, will serve to give a view of the principal arguments for and against the Bill, and to show the state of feeling among different Parties in regard to it.

#### “THE MAYNOOTH BILL.

“Petitions against this Bill were poured in from all quarters. It is impossible to give a complete list of them. They were presented by the Duke of Buckingham, from Birmingham, signed by 10,000 persons; by the Marquis of Salisbury; by the

Earl of Harewood, signed by 20,000 persons; by the Earl of Winchilsea (162,) from places in Norfolk, Suffolk, Kent, &c.; by the Bishop of Rochester; by the Earl of Clancarty; by the Bishop of Cashel; by Lord Denman, from Birmingham, signed by the Mayor and Corporation, and from places in Derbyshire; by the Marquis of Normanby; by Lord Beaumont, Lord Kenyon (3,) the Earl of Bandon, the Earl of Besborough, the Earl of Charleville (9,) Lord Lilford, the Earl of Hardwicke (4,) the Earl of Roden (26;) by the Duke of Richmond, from the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and six others; by the Earl of Falmouth (7,) the Earl of Chichester (several,) the Marquis of Ely (3,) the Earl of Scarborough (7,) the Earl of Malmesbury, Earl Brownlow; by the Bishop of Exeter, from Exeter and six other places; and a great number by the Duke of Newcastle, the Bishop of Winchester, the Marquis of Downshire, the Bishop of Norwich (the Right Rev. Prelate said, he could not concur in the prayer of the petitioners;) the Bishops of London, Oxford, Lichfield, St. David's, Durham, Gloucester, Lincoln, and Bangor; Earl Fitzwilliam, the Earl of Burlington, Lord Wharncliffe, and the Duke of Buccleuch.

"The Marquis of Breadalbane presented sixty-seven Petitions, with upwards of 8,000 signatures, against the Endowment of Maynooth; and twenty-one Petitions, with 4,622 signatures, against all State Endowments of Religion, and therefore opposing the Grant to Maynooth; one of the latter, from the inhabitants of Aberdeen, had upwards of 2,000 signatures.

"The Earl of Eldon, Lord Farnham, and Lord Feversham also presented numerous Petitions against the Bill, the whole number of which, it is not easy to ascertain.

"The DUKE OF WELLINGTON, on moving the order of the day for the Second Reading of the Maynooth College Bill, said,—My Lords, I think it my duty to request your Lordships' attention, whilst I state to your Lordships the principles of this Measure, and the nature of the proposition which has been submitted to your Lordships in this Bill, in order to carry into execution its object, namely, the maintenance of this Institution. My Lords, this institution was founded fifty years ago by the Irish Parliament, and this Bill contains a recital of the provisions of the Acts by which it was originally founded, and by which it was regulated; first, in the year 1800, and subsequently in the year 1808. My Lords, it cannot be denied, and I will not stand here to be the person to deny, that those Acts are inconsistent with the enactment of the codes of law, by which the Reformation was established in this Country and in Ireland; but, my Lords, although those Acts are inconsistent with the enactment of those codes of law, I deny that there is—and I think I can show to your Lordships that there is not—anything inconsistent in those laws with the Religious principles of the Country; and that it was never so considered, either fifty years ago, or subsequently in 1800, or in 1808; and that it cannot be so considered at the present moment. My Lords, in order clearly to understand the principles on which those laws were founded, it is necessary that I should call the attention of your Lordships to the state of affairs at the period when they were first enacted. The necessity of this institution was occasioned by the failure of the laws enacted to establish the Reformation in Ireland. My Lords, those laws, and the enactments of those laws had been resisted in Ireland, from the period at which they had become the laws of the land; plot succeeded plot, rebellion succeeded rebellion, forfeiture of property succeeded forfeiture of property; and at length the Country had become the seat of the operations of a foreign and civil war, in a contest for the possession of the Throne.

“The DUKE OF NEWCASTLE.—My Lords, I rise to order. I beg to apologize to the Noble Duke and to the House for attempting to interrupt him; but, preliminary to this discussion, I would put this question to the Noble Duke—whether he has the Queen’s permission to make this proposition to the House. (Cries of ‘Order, order.’)”

This was objected to by Lord Brougham as out of Order, but—

“The DUKE OF NEWCASTLE, having felt it his duty to make the interruption, must say he thought the present was a most improper discussion.

“The DUKE OF WELLINGTON, resuming—If I had heard the question—I am afraid my infirmity prevented my hearing it exactly at first—I should certainly have had no objection to answer the Noble Duke any question that he may put, though certainly he put his question in a disorderly manner; but I did not hear it. My Lords, I was stating to your Lordships the causes of one of the Measures, of which the recital is given in the Bill before you—I mean the Act of the Irish Parliament of 1795. It was occasioned by the failure to establish the Reformation in Ireland. I was saying, that, after a long period of successive plots, rebellions, and forfeitures of property; and after a civil contest which ensued, assisted by Foreign forces, had been carried on in Ireland for the possession of the Crown—that contest had been succeeded by Acts of Parliament, and the Penal Code—enacted for the purpose of supporting the Sovereign on the Throne, and protecting the Reformed Religion of the Church of England—had been introduced into Ireland in the way to which I have adverted. But, my Lords, from the period of the introduction of that code down to the year 1795, during which the Reformation could not be carried into execution completely in Ireland, the Ecclesiastics for the service of the Roman Catholic Missions in that Country had been educated in Seminaries in Foreign Countries; there were never wanting Ecclesiastics for the performance of the duties of the Roman Catholic mission in Ireland. In the mean time, during the reign of George III., the Penal Laws had been repealed, and the rest of them in 1793, two years before this subject came to be taken into consideration.”

The Noble Duke then went into an historical statement respecting the original foundation of the College at Maynooth, and insisted much on the names of those who had concurred in recommending or adopting the Measure; and, on the fact that none of them appeared to have any Religious objections to the plan, or to apprehend any danger to the Protestant Cause, or to the Religious Establishments of the Country. But the Noble Duke did not attempt to show, that these Statesmen, or those whom they consulted, had ever investigated the nature of the Education which was given at Maynooth, or its influence on the Students in that College. He mentioned the names of Lord Chancellor Fitzgibbon, the Archbishop of Cashel, the Earl of Shannon, the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Lord Chief Baron Yelverton, Mr. Speaker Foster, Mr. Wolfe, the Attorney-General, afterwards Chief Justice of the King’s Bench, Lord Kilwarden, who was murdered in the streets of Dublin in an insurrection that occurred. The measure was recommended to Earl Camden by these individuals. It was sent over to England, and committed to the consideration of the Duke of Portland,



who was then Secretary of State ; and he, as it appears, consulted the opinion of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Moore, before he took the pleasure of the Sovereign on it ; and then it was returned to Ireland with the approbation of His Majesty King George III. And it would seem, that this mere array of names must serve in the place of argument, and set aside the investigation of facts and documents, which were open to the examination of the House of Lords, if they had only called for the production of the Class Books and Standards of Maynooth.

If these Books contain principles which are hostile to the Religion and Liberties—the Throne and Government—of this Protestant Nation, does the Noble Duke imagine, that this mere array of names can alter the facts, or supersede the necessity of investigation ?

“ But, my Lords, one circumstance I beg your Lordships’ attention to, because it is of importance that it should be clearly understood. This Measure was taken into consideration, in this and the other House of Parliament, before the Union ; but before any decision was come to, the Articles of the Union were agreed to. I wish your Lordships would allow me to say a very few words on the Seventh Article—to show, that this and the other House of Parliament had cognisance of this Measure previous to the Union. By the Seventh Article it is provided, ‘ that a sum not less than the sum granted by the Parliament of Ireland on an average of six years immediately preceding the 1st of January, 1800, in premiums for the internal encouragement of agriculture or manufactures, or for the maintaining institutions for pious and charitable purposes, shall be applied, for the period of twenty years after the Union, in such manner as the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall direct.’ What can be clearer than these words ? Did any one ever hear, in the records of Parliament, in this or in the other House, anything against the Measure at that time ? But what followed ? The Measure was discussed in Parliament after the Union, in the year 1808 ; and—though there was a difference of opinion between the parties, as to the amount for which the Grant ought to be made for the support of the Institution, and the subject was discussed during different succeeding Sessions,—yet, my Lords, although objections were made to an increase of the Grant, not a word was said as to the Religious principle,—not a word was said about danger to our Religious Establishment ; it was thought that the enlarged Grant was too much, and the enlarged Grant was objected to, but never on the score of Religious principle. Then, my Lords, I say, that Religious principle is as safe now as it was at that time ; it has been safe ever since, and it is safe at this moment. I am then, my Lords, to call upon your Lordships to consider of the expediency of continuing this Institution. Can there be a doubt, my Lords, of the absolute necessity of providing some means of educating Roman Catholic priests for the service of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland ? The population of Ireland was at that time about 3,000,000 ; it had increased to 8,251,000 in the year 1841, and it is now about 8,500,000. Of that number, about seven-eighths are considered to be Roman Catholics ; and there can be no doubt, whatever the number may be, that a very large proportion are Roman Catholics. And, my Lords, we cannot avoid their being Roman Catholics ; and *we must find some means of providing them with Ecclesiastics capable of teaching them the rites of the Roman Catholic Religion ; and we must find them means of education*

*at home, or we encourage the sending them abroad.\** My Lords, it is very true that the Country is not now in the situation in which it was in 1795; but I beg your Lordships not to believe that, because we are at peace with all the world,—and I trust we shall so continue,—it is desirable that we should establish such a communication between this Country and that part of her Majesty's dominions, as that we should send persons to Foreign Countries, to be educated as priests to administer the rites of the Roman Catholic Religion in Ireland. My Lords, I beg to recall your Lordships' recollection to the events of the last few years. We have seen Meetings in Ireland which have created a considerable degree of alarm; we have seen assemblies having for their object the obtaining, by tumult and threats, the Repeal of the Union between this Country and Ireland. My Lords, you have seen the interest which these transactions have excited in Foreign Countries; you have seen Foreigners sent to Ireland, to attend these tumultuous Meetings, and subscriptions raised in Foreign Countries for the purpose of promoting the object of these tumultuous assemblies; you have seen publications in Foreign Countries, and writings upon the transactions in Ireland, relative to this very question of the Repeal of the Union. Can any of your Lordships think, under these circumstances, it is desirable, that you should encourage the Ecclesiastics, who are to administer the rites of the Roman Catholic Religion in Ireland, to resort for their education to those Foreign Countries? But, my Lords, I need not dwell longer upon the mischief of sending persons abroad to be educated as Ecclesiastics. I beg your Lordships to advert to the state of Religion in all those Foreign Countries in which education must be sought for those Ecclesiastics. Look at Germany, look at the Netherlands, look at Italy, look at France, and wherever you will; and I ask your Lordships, whether it is desirable that we should receive Ecclesiastics for Ireland from these Countries, to give us the advantage of additional Religious divisions in that Country? Now, my Lords, it is for these reasons that we come forward to recommend to your Lordships to continue this Institution, and to create a domestic education for those Ecclesiastics, who are to administer the rites of the Roman Catholic Religion to such of her Majesty's subjects as profess that Religion in Ireland. My Lords, in bringing this subject under your Lordships' consideration,—having stated to you, that there is nothing in the Measure inconsistent with Religious principle, and that it is at present as necessary as it was in the year 1795,—I beg to submit to your Lordships the proposition, that it is absolutely impossible to maintain it *as it is*. I laid a paper on your Lordships' table two or three days ago, with reference to the state of this Institution; it was a Report made to Her Majesty's Government in the month of December last. There is no doubt of the truth of the representations it contains. The Report states, that the Institution, as it exists, is not sufficient for the demands for educating the persons who are upon it. The Report states, the ruinous condition in which the buildings are; the absolute impossibility of its accommodating, with attention to common decency, the number of persons belonging to it; that there is not space or convenience for carrying on the ordinary business of such an Institution. It states the inadequate accommodations for the Professors and others employed in the instruction of the Students, and the inadequate manner in which they are rewarded. My Lords, however necessary it may be, that the Institution should be maintained for the purpose of affording education to Ecclesiastics, in

---

\* It seems quite forgotten by the Noble Duke, that the Roman Catholics of Ireland could more easily and cheaply educate their priests at *home* than *abroad*; and that they are very well able to do it, if they will.—EDITOR.

number sufficient for the purpose of performing the duties of Religion in Ireland, it is not equal to that purpose in its present state; and therefore it is, that Her Majesty's Government have thought it proper,—considering the nature of the Institution and the necessity of continuing it—considering it as an Institution formed by this great Country,—that it ought to be established on the same plan and on the same footing as other Institutions are, for the purpose of the education of Ecclesiastics to perform the duties of the Roman Catholic Religion in Ireland. I agree with a Noble Friend behind me, that we ought to elevate the character of these Ecclesiastics. We all know that they must, and that they do, exercise great spiritual influence over the minds of those amongst whom they are employed; and we know they will always exercise great social influence in Ireland. Is it reasonable, that we should neglect to educate them in such a manner, as that they may exercise that social influence in a manner and for purposes that must lead to the public benefit and happiness of the Country? These young men ought to have, as others have, as soon as they are capable of enjoying them, the comforts and decencies and conveniences of life,—instead of being packed up three or four in one room, and without any means of having the comforts of life about them; they ought to enjoy the conveniences of their class in life; they ought to be instructed in Science and Literature, as well as in Theology; they ought to have the apparatus, they ought to have the books, they ought to have Professors to instruct them in all the branches of Science, and the instruments and books, in all the branches of knowledge necessary for the performance of the important duties they will afterwards be called upon to fulfil. I am aware of the prejudice existing against this Institution, and against those who are educated there. My Lords, I have nothing to say to that subject except this; that an Institution, reduced so low as this is represented to be in the papers before your Lordships, cannot have answered the purpose for which it was established by Parliament (hear, hear;) and the object of the Measure we propose is, that the character of the Institution shall be raised, and that the character of those educated at it shall be raised, with a view to elevating the character and station of those who administer the rites of the Roman Catholic Religion in Ireland to a level with those in Foreign Countries; that their means of education, manners, and habits, may entitle them to the highest respect; and to exercise, in a proper manner, that influence over the social habits of the people, to which they would be entitled by their station, their education, and their acquirements. My Lords, if this Measure shall have the effect of providing such men for the Ministry, I say, we shall have rendered a service to the public, by introducing this Bill and recommending it to your Lordships' attention. With this view I bring forward this Measure; and I hope it will not be found inconsistent with principle, nor likely to injure any Religious Establishment; and I now draw your Lordships' attention to the details of the Bill, to show where it is consistent with the enactments of the existing Law, where it differs, and the reasons for the difference."

"The Noble Duke then observed, that, in point of fact the original Institution was incorporated. By the original Act of Parliament, the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice, and others, were appointed trustees and visitors; and the visitors were authorised to establish and *endow* (the Noble Duke uttered this word very emphatically) this Seminary for the education of Roman Catholics. The original Bill gave to them the power of purchasing land to a certain amount; it gave them the power of making by-laws, and of governing the Establishment. The subsequent Bill, after altering the visitatorial Establishment and the Establishment of Trustees, gave to the Trustees established by that Act additional powers belonging

to a Corporation; that is, enabling the Trustees to sue and be sued by their Secretary, which, I believe, is a power given solely to Corporations.

"The Noble Duke then went further into the details of the Bill: and with respect to the proposal to makè the Endowment permanent, he said:

"My Lords, I confess that I listened with great pleasure, some time ago, to a speech made by a Noble Marquis on this subject, in which he stated, that he approved of making the Grant permanent, with a view of putting an end to the perpetually recurring annual discussions upon this question. My Lords, I confess that that made a great impression upon my mind, and I consider that nothing can be more wise than such a course. I would make the Grant perpetual, if only to put an end to the discussions annually recurring on a Grant, in the maintenance of which only persons in one Country are interested, but in reference to which so much ill-feeling and prejudice exists in the other. My Lords, I do say, therefore, that I think it is most desirable that you should pass this Bill, if for no other object than that one which I have mentioned; I do think that, this Institution being necessary, you should take the money for its support from the Consolidated Fund, and make the Grant for its support a permanent one. I have already stated to your Lordships my belief, that the Grant to this Institution never involved any Religious opinion or any Religious principle; it has not done so in any past time, and it cannot do so now. But I beg leave to remind your Lordships, that you have now maintained this Institution for fifty years; you have maintained it through long periods, during the agitation of questions affecting the interests of Ireland; and when there were Roman Catholic Associations, and other bodies, against which you had to make Enactments. You have had Coercion Bills, and other measures of that description. The greatest difficulty of all, the greatest discussion of all, was certainly put an end to about fifteen years ago, namely, in the year 1829. *But, my Lords, we cannot say that we have since had in Ireland a very tranquil state of affairs.* On the very morrow of the day on which that Bill was passed, measures were taken for the purpose of exciting discussion and agitation on the question of the Repeal of the Union; and a good deal of tumult and a good deal of difficulty arose out of that question. Particularly in the year 1843, there existed that which excited a good deal of anxiety, and, in some, a degree of terror. Men doubted—I am merely drawing your Lordships' attention to those circumstances, and stating the effect which they produced in Foreign Countries—men doubted, whether it would be possible to resist the attempt made to carry, by tumult and by violence, the repeal of the Union. My Lords, whatever opinion may be entertained as to the legal effect of the decision of your Lordships' House upon a writ of error, delivered in the month of September last, I believe there is no man in his senses who now doubts, that it is absolutely impossible—absolutely hopeless and impossible—to carry any measure by violence and tumult in Ireland, against the wishes of the Government and Parliament of this Country. I believe there is no man in his senses who now doubts that fact; and *that* is the situation in which your Lordships are this day called upon, to take into your consideration this question. Now, my Lords, standing as you do at this moment in strength and without any danger whatever pressing upon you,—knowing as you do, that the principal part of the persons concerned in these tumults and acts of violence were of the Roman Catholic religion—although there were certainly some exceptions, and I believe many Roman Catholics are as much attached to the Union as any of ourselves,—I beseech your Lordships to take that into your consideration. Look at our situation of strength at present, and say whether, having maintained this Institution as you have done for fifty years, it would not seem a little like per-

secution, if you were now to turn round and say,—‘We are aware of the necessity of its continuance, but we will not let it go on any longer?’ Would it not look, I ask, a little like persecuting that party? Now, my Lords, I told you, that there is no Religion in this question; but I do say, that there is a great Christian principle involved in that to which I have adverted. I say, that, if you are strong, it is your duty not to persecute the people; and further, it is your duty not even to appear to persecute the people.\* And I entreat your Lordships to stand by me in enforcing that principle, and to give your unanimous assent to the Bill, of which I have now the honour to move the Second Reading.

“The LORD CHANCELLOR having put the question, that the Bill be read a second time,

“The DUKE OF CAMBRIDGE said,—My Lords, I am not often in the habit of troubling your Lordships, but I feel that on such an important question as this, it is my duty not to give a silent vote. Attached as I feel, and have always felt, to my own Religion—the Established Religion of the Country—I am sure that, if I could convince myself that there was the least danger of injury to that Religion in passing this Measure, I should be the last man to give it my support. I look at the question, my Lords, as a Political question, and not as a Religious one. From the statement which has been made by the Noble Duke as to the state of the College, it is perfectly clear, that, with the present Grant, it is impossible to procure proper persons to educate the priesthood. If we have not good schoolmasters and schoolmistresses in this Country, we know that it is impossible that the schools can flourish; how much more must this be the case, as regards those who are to become the instructors of the Students in this College! This, I own, is my view of this Measure. It is, in my opinion, the most conciliatory Measure which has been proposed for many years.

“The EARL OF RODEN said, it grieved him at all times to differ from the Noble Duke who introduced this Measure; but particularly, to differ from him on a question involving the vital interests of this Country. He should be guilty of a great dereliction of duty, as a Member of their Lordships’ House, and standing in the position which he did with his Protestant fellow-countrymen, were he not to take the earliest opportunity of endeavouring to stop the progress of this Bill—concluding, as he would, with an Amendment, that, before they proceeded any further, they should appoint a Select Committee upstairs, to inquire into the instruction which was given in that Seminary, which Parliament was now, for the first time, called upon permanently to endow. There were points connected with that subject, which it was very difficult for him to handle; for he was aware, that it trenched upon the Religious opinions of some of their Lordships; and he could have no sympathy with the man, be he who he might, who had no respect for the Religious sensibility of others, or who would, without compunction, even in the path of duty, utter one word to pain any individual whatsoever. But, as he should be obliged to make use of expressions and to refer to documents, which might not be agreeable to some of their Lordships, all he could say was, that he should do it with pain; and that he should not do it at all, if it were not necessary for the object which he had in view. Both as a Member of that and the other House of Parliament, he had always thought it inconsistent in a Protestant Government, to vote even an Annual Grant to the

---

\* It cannot fail to strike the reader, how different the Noble Duke’s concluding argument is, from the argument of Danger urged by Sir R. Peel.—EDITOR.

College of Maynooth; and he had not hesitated to give it his opposition. How much more must he be opposed to a Measure, differing from the Annual Grant, not only in degree, but also in principle! In the case of the Annual Grant, there was, at all events, an opportunity afforded for an annual retrospect of the proceedings of the Institution to which the Grant was given. The College of Maynooth was, then, a Roman Catholic Institution—though supported and tolerated by the State. But when they admitted the principle of Endowment, it became a State Institution, for which the State was responsible; and he defied any Noble Lord to show him one line, or one word, in this Bill, which would enable the State to discharge her responsibility in reference to this College. He could not look upon this Measure, as the Noble Duke regarded it, as one of pence, shillings, and pence. He could not but look upon it as a Measure which involved the conscientious and religious feelings of the great majority of this Empire. If he wanted any proof of this, he had only to refer to the Petitions which had been placed on the table; and at no former period, he must say, had such anxiety been shown on any subject, as had been manifested in reference to that under consideration. These Petitions emanated from men in the middle, in the higher, and in the humbler classes of society; they emanated, too, from persons who were well acquainted with the subject to which they referred; and their Lordships must forgive him if he added, as well acquainted with it as any of those whom he had the honour of addressing. They proceeded from men who were under no political bias, and who had no political object to gain—the petitioners consisting of persons of all classes, of all Denominations, and of all shades of politics. They had received Petitions from members of the Church of England, from Wesleyans, from Independents, from Baptists, from members of the Free Church of Scotland. All classes of Protestants had laid aside their minor differences, and united in what he must call a ‘holy union,’ to resist what they believed to be contrary to that Word of Truth, from which they took their opinions; and, resting upon which, they felt themselves to be standing on strong and immovable ground. In some of these Petitions, that distinction was drawn, to which he had already alluded, between Toleration and Endowment; and, in stating this distinction, he must declare, that he was following the opinions of many great men who had adorned this Country; and whom, when he mentioned their names, their Lordships would acknowledge to be worthy of being quoted as authorities. His Lordship then quoted the opinion of Mr. Wilberforce, as being opposed to the Measure. He then complained, that the Protestants in Ireland had not had fair play; and instanced the withdrawing of all Government assistance from various incorporated Protestant Societies—contrasted with the assistance given to the National Board of Education.

“Two grounds were urged, on which they were asked to agree to the Bill. The one was, that it was a measure which was to give peace to Ireland, by conciliating the Roman Catholic inhabitants of that Country. The other was, that the Measure would promote a better education among the Clergy of the Roman Catholic Church; and this ground had been particularly adverted to by the Noble Duke on the present occasion. He thought he would be able to show their Lordships, that neither of those objects was likely to be attained.

“With respect to the first argument used in favour of the Bill,—that it would be received by the Roman Catholics with gratitude, and that it would be a means of producing a great change in their feelings,—he could assure their Lordships, that no man would be more anxious than he, to do anything that would conciliate his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects,—provided that what he was called on to do was not contrary to his principles. To any measure which was contrary to his principles, he

never would consent,—believing, as he did, that, in public as in private life, it was always bad policy to do evil that good might come of it. With regard to this Measure in particular, he did not believe that it would effect the objects expected from it, because it had been received in Ireland as a Measure extorted by fear. If it was so received, of course it lost all its value as a Measure of conciliation. In proof of what he said, he would read their Lordships extracts from a letter of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Ardagh, and of a Roman Catholic priest. This was the gratitude of a Roman Catholic Bishop; and, according to his own account, of his diocese also, for this Bill. But he had also an extract from a letter of a Roman Catholic priest. It was from Priest M'Genny, Parish Priest of Clones, in the County of Monaghan, to the Chairman of the Monster Meeting at Dundalk, dated the 2d of April, 1845. [He then read it at length.] It concluded by saying, 'I may not mix in the ranks of combat; but I will bless your arms, and may victory crown your exertions.—Francis M'Genny, P. P.' It was true that some of this language might appear to their Lordships to be laughable; but its effect was far different on the minds to whom it was usually addressed. But, although those gentlemen professed to believe, that this Measure had been conceded by the Government from fear,—he (Lord Roden) by no means coincided in that opinion. On the contrary, he believed, that a considerable share of popularity was expected by the promoters of the Bill. They expected that its effect would be such, as to enable her Majesty to set foot in Dublin with safety. On the other hand, he believed, that the promoters of the Bill were little prepared for the feelings with which it had been regarded by the outraged people of England. What had been the effect in Ireland? No sooner had a voice gone from St. Stephen's—declaring the satisfaction of Government that this Measure had been announced to Ireland before a dark cloud appeared on the western horizon—no sooner was that declaration coupled with another, that it was impossible for the Government to put down agitation in Ireland by force,—no sooner did these avowals of the head of the Government reach Conciliation Hall in Dublin, than the agitation was revived, and programmes of Monster Meetings were sent throughout the Country. One had already been held at Dundalk, another at Navan; and another was to be held at Cork. He had also seen in the newspapers, that a fourth Meeting was fixed to be held on the 1st of July, on the banks of the Boyne. Now, he asked, was this affront to the Protestants of Ireland to be suffered by her Majesty's Government? was it to be permitted, that one of these Monster Meetings should be held on the 1st of July on the banks of the Boyne—on the very spot and on the very day that William III. of glorious and immortal memory—on the very spot where he fought and bled, and gained for England those liberties which she had ever since enjoyed?—was it possible, that the Ministry would allow the feelings of the Protestants of Ireland to be so outraged? Did not the Government owe something to those brave men, who, at their request, gave up their loyal Meetings on that day, when it had for years been their custom to celebrate their principles, and the victories gained on the 1st of July on the banks of the Boyne? Contrast that expression—that it was impossible to put down the agitation for Repeal by force of arms—contrast it with what was done by the Government in 1843. That was called the great Repeal year in Ireland. The greatest alarm and excitement prevailed. The inhabitants of the Country took refuge in the Towns. Many of them came to this Country. Others, who had not the means of so doing, emigrated to America; there to find that peace for themselves and their families, which they could not find at home. And was their alarm groundless? The Government, at least, did not seem to think so; for they fortified the barracks and sent armed ships to the coast, for the

purpose of taking away those who might be exposed to danger. At length they determined to stop the Monster Meetings; and they began with that at Clontarf. What was the consequence of that one act of vigour? Why, that the Repeal funds fell below par, and that the members of Repeal Societies hid their diminished heads, while, although the leaders were not silent, their language was very different from what it had been before. In the year 1844, Ireland enjoyed an unprecedented prosperity. Anxiety about Repeal was changed for interest in railroads, in commerce, and in the general improvement of the Country. But now this unfortunate Measure had revived the agitation; the Monster Meetings were renewed; and a state of things existed, which, if allowed to continue, must prove fatal to the peace, happiness and prosperity of the people of Ireland.

“The second argument used in favour of the Bill was, that it would improve the education of the priest! He found no provision in the Bill for effecting this object. On the contrary, he found, that it was only to continue the same system, but to provide for a great extension of numbers. What had hitherto been the effect of this Institution on the character of the priests? Had it, in accordance with the views of its founders, made them more friendly to the interests of England? He would furnish their Lordships with some authority besides his own on this subject, and one that was not biased in favour of Protestant influence in Ireland. He referred to the tour of Mr. Inglis in that Country, in which there occurred this passage:—‘I entertain no doubt, that the disorders which originate in hatred of Protestantism have been increased by the Maynooth education of the Roman Catholic priesthood. It is the Maynooth priest who is the agitating priest; and, if the foreign-educated priest be a more liberal-minded man, less a zealot, and less a hater of Protestantism, than is consistent with the present spirit of Catholicism in Ireland, straightway an assistant, red-hot from Maynooth, is appointed to the parish. In no Country in Europe, no, not even in Spain, is the spirit of Popery so intensely anti-Protestant as it is in Ireland.’ Those who lived in Ireland experienced this every day; they had reason to wish, that what the Noble Duke held out as the consequence of this Bill were the case,—that it was likely to give a better education to the Roman Catholic priesthood. The truth of what Mr. Inglis stated was being proved by what was taking place in many parts of Ireland; in one district particularly, poor Roman Catholics were suffering for acting according to the dictates of their consciences. He alluded to Dingle, in the County of Kerry. There, for the last three or four years, the Scriptures had been circulated among the people in the Irish language. The consequence had been, that many had left the Roman Catholic Church and joined the Protestant Establishment; the number amounted, he was informed, to 800 souls. These did not consist merely of the lower classes; among them was one Catholic priest, and, he believed, one Magistrate. These changes produced great violence and persecution towards the converts, who stated their case in a Memorial to the Lord Lieutenant, dated January 9, 1845. [He then read the Memorial and the Lord Lieutenant’s answer.] He could not but think, that Mr. Inglis took a right view of the question when he said, not even in Catholic Spain was Popery so intensely anti-Protestant as in Ireland. The case of Dingle was not an isolated one. In other parts of Ireland their Protestant fellow-subjects were suffering the same kind of persecution.

“He had been very anxious to state to the House, what was the degree of loyalty prevalent in the College of Maynooth. For information on that point, he had turned to the Evidence taken before the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the state of Ireland in 1825; and there he found the examination of Mr.



O'Connell on this subject. He said:—'The priests who were educated in France were very strong Anti-Jacobins . . . By that means, there was among them a great deal of what is called 'Ultra-Royalism;' but with the priests educated at Maynooth, the Anti-Jacobin feeling is gone by, and they are more identified with the people: and, therefore, in the phrase that is usually called 'Loyalty,' they do not come within the description of it so much as the priests educated in France.' He (Lord Roden) implied, therefore, from this, that there must be something in the College of Maynooth, that did not tend to promote loyalty. He was further corroborated in this opinion, by the statement of a gentleman who had been himself educated in that College. At a Meeting at which he (Lord Roden) presided, this gentleman was asked to state, what he knew as to the loyalty of the College? He said:—'The first session held at Maynooth subsequent to the entrance of freshmen into that Seminary, it is supposed, that all will take the Oath of Allegiance in open Court, as prescribed by Law to be taken by Roman Catholics. The evening previous to the opening of the Court in the year 1825, the Senior Dean announced to us, that it was required of us to take the oath of allegiance. Had a bomb-shell burst amongst us, it could not have caused us freshmen of that year greater dismay and consternation. To swear allegiance to a Protestant King and Constitution, were things that never entered into the heads of any, previous to his going to that Seminary; but, in order to calm our minds, and induce us to swallow the disagreeable draught, the Dean left with us two or three copies of Friar O'Leary's *Treatise on the Roman Catholic Oath*. This work was read with attention. The nicely drawn distinction of a double allegiance was discussed and argued. The arguments of O'Leary made no impression on the greater part of the students, so deep was the leaven of disloyalty fermenting in their souls. Some feigned sickness, in order to evade the awful calamity of loyalty; others openly declared, they would prefer leaving the College to swearing allegiance to a Protestant crowned head. The awful morning arrived. The Dean called over the muster-roll; some were absent, under the plea of sickness; but such as mustered sufficient courage to undergo this ordeal were ordered to bring Testaments with them. Ten or twelve Testaments were the most that could be mustered amongst 100 candidates for the priesthood. On our entering the Court all business was suspended. The officer produced the roll, with the Oath inscribed thereon. The oath was audibly read by the officer, and we were ordered to repeat the words after him. Some told me they had repeated different words to those of the oath; and one in particular told me, he had not touched the book, nor repeated a word of the Oath. A Diocesan of mine told me, he always contrived to get sick at the approach of the quarter sessions; and thus evaded, during five or six years' residence at Maynooth, taking the Oath of Allegiance.' That gentleman, who stated these facts, told him, afterwards, that he was ready, if a Committee of inquiry were appointed, to swear to the truth of every word he said. These statements he (Lord Roden) thought, made the loyalty of Maynooth more than equivocal. But what did all this disloyalty and violence on the part of the priesthood arise from? The cause must be found in the system of education followed in that Institution.

"The Noble Duke had never touched on the manner, in which a better education to the priesthood was to be secured. If it was the Ultramontane doctrines which were taught in Maynooth, he thought there were Roman Catholic authorities to prove, that they were doctrines contrary to the rights of Kings, and interfering between subjects and their allegiance to their Sovereign; and this Bill was not worth a farthing, if it did not do something to remove them: it was to ascertain whether

these doctrines were taught or not, that he was anxious to obtain this Committee. He knew he should be told, there had been an investigation already. In 1825, the state of education at Maynooth, and other places in Ireland, was inquired into; but, from what cause he knew not, certainly the result of that investigation was most unsatisfactory. The Commission separated, without agreeing to any Report with respect to the College of Maynooth; they laid the evidence on the table, but they made no Report. If an inquiry was thought necessary in 1825, when the College was supported by an annual Grant,—now they were introducing a new and more objectionable principle, they ought to have another investigation, and one better than a Commission,—an inquiry before a Select Committee of their Lordships' House. He thought that he had an authority for the proposition, with which he was about to conclude, which the Noble Lords behind him would not be able to resist. It was an extract from a speech, made in 1840, by Sir Robert Peel, on this very subject. Sir R. Peel then said:—'I cannot agree that the system of education carried on at Maynooth is a matter of indifference to the Legislature. I think that the system pursued at Maynooth is a legitimate matter of consideration for Parliament; and that it would be an abandonment of duty, were the House of Commons to avow a doctrine, which would allow us to say to the Roman Catholic Professor, 'Here is the money; we are pledged to grant it; you may do with it as you please; inculcate doctrines subversive of order and injurious to morality; and we cannot interfere.' However, I recollect that the College of Maynooth has already been the subject of minute inquiry—that the evidence taken was laid on the table; and that, notwithstanding that evidence, I considered it perfectly reconcilable with my duty, to continue my support to the Grant. If there be any well-founded objection to the system of Maynooth, all I can say is,—that the Principals of the College would be, of all others, the persons most interested in repelling them, and challenging the inquiry. I would advise them to do so by all means, for the sake of conciliating their Protestant brethren; nothing short of absolute proof of abuse, will render it proper for the House to enter into a pledge as to the positive withdrawal of this Grant. But if all these complaints were removed, I should vote for the Grant with much greater satisfaction than I do now, when so strong an impression prevails, that the system of education stands in need of improvement.' That was an authority, to which he thought the Noble Lords behind him must bow; and he did not see how they could refuse to vote for the Amendment which he intended to propose, for an inquiry into the system of education pursued at Maynooth. The Protestants of the United Kingdom demanded this inquiry.

"In reference to the instruction now given at Maynooth, he referred their Lordships to one or two books used there, in order to prove that the Ultramontane doctrines were taught at the College. He found the 'Commentary on the Scriptures,' by Menochius, Delahogue's 'Dogmatic Theology,' and other works. Thomas Aquinas was also used. There was another authority to which he must refer—that of the late Mr. Alexander Knox. That gentleman was the private Secretary to Lord Castlereagh, when he was Minister in Ireland, when Maynooth College was first established; he was also appointed to the office of Treasurer of Maynooth, which he held to the day of his death. 'The views,' said Mr. Knox, 'which originated the College were marked by much wisdom. The working of the Institution, during its first years, was happy; and had the intelligent spirit that gave birth to it, continued to watch over and foster its growth, Ireland might to-day have been a Protestant Country, or nearly so. The first Professors were French refugee Clergymen, Gallican in their principles, but lately escaped from the rope and lamp-post of

the French Revolution—disgusted with everything in the shape of popular movement, and grateful to England for the shelter afforded to them. Under their presidency, the principles dominant in the College were those of the Gallican Church, the most independent and enlightened member of the Papacy; nay, from the combined influences of their new position, they were themselves strongly attracted towards our Establishment—which some of them, men of respectability and learning, entered as Ministers. Those who went not thus far in outward profession, yet continued to teach a very mitigated Romanism, which eventually would have merged into a purer Creed. These tendencies and this probability were, however, extinguished by that body of men, which, under Elizabeth, had prevented England from becoming wholly Protestant. But a few years prior to the establishment of Maynooth, some members of the Jesuit body,—described by themselves or their friends, as a few poor ancient men, seeking in England a resting-place denied them by their co-religionists on the Continent of Europe,—had been allowed to settle at Stoneyhurst, in Lancashire. They soon hung out at their doors their customary ensign, professing to aim at nothing but the educating the higher classes of their own communion. But, whilst other Romanists seemed paralysed by the misfortunes which had prostrated their Church in Europe generally, these men were even now keenly intent on its revival. The tendency of what was going on in Maynooth being at once perceived, they contrived to buy the property of Castle Brown, in its neighbourhood—ostensibly as a school for the sons of the Irish Roman Catholic gentry; but with the main object of obtaining access into, and influence over, the Maynooth Institution. Their efforts were, at no long interval of time, successful; and, from that period, the whole tone and bearing of the College were effectually changed. Gallican principles were replaced by the severest Ultramontane and anti-Protestant doctrines; and the spring, whose waters seemed destined to fertilize this poor Country, has ever since been pouring over it streams the most baleful.

“While on this part of the subject, he (Lord Roden) would ask their Lordships, How this Bill was calculated to improve the system of education at Maynooth? Was there anything in the Bill, which would offer a guarantee, that the Ultramontane doctrine would give way to the Gallican?—anything that could annul the contract made between the Cardinal-Prefect of the Propaganda at Rome and the Ecclesiastical Trustees at Maynooth? He saw nothing in the Bill, in any degree providing for the improvement of the education of the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland.”

The Noble Earl then went into the religious grounds of opposition to the Bill; and showed that it would be regarded as a “heavy blow” by the Protestants in Ireland, on whose loyalty and attachment to this Country so much depended.

“He had trespassed at great length upon their Lordships’ attention, but he had expressed the sentiments of his heart; and nothing would have induced him to claim their indulgence for so long a time, but a deep sense of the importance of this Measure. He begged to move, as an Amendment, that a Select Committee be appointed, to inquire into the Class-books used, and the general course of instruction imparted, at the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth; and that this Bill be referred to that Committee.”

It would be highly desirable to proceed with this important discussion: but this volume has already grown to a bulk far beyond what was, in

the first design of it, anticipated. It must therefore suffice to say, that the Debate was continued by

*The Bishop of London*, who ably and faithfully opposed the Bill.

The Earl of St. Germans vindicated its provisions.

*The Duke of Manchester* stated some very important facts, in a speech which he afterwards published ; and strenuously opposed the Measure.

Lord Beaumont, on the part of the Roman Catholics, denied many of the statements of the opponents of the Bill, and supported the Measure.

*The Bishop of Cashel* strenuously opposed it.

Lord Clifford opposed the Motion for inquiry as needless.

On Tuesday, June 3rd,

The Earl of Hardwicke supported the Bill, and deprecated inquiry.

The Earl of Carnarvon also spoke in favour of it.

*The Earl of Winchilsea* reprobated the Measure, as the most deadly blow ever aimed at our National Protestantism.

The Marquis of Normanby supported the Bill ; and, in so doing, personally attacked the Bishop of Cashel,—ascribing to him, upon hearsay evidence, the use of expressions, in his primary Charge, which the Right Rev. Prelate entirely denied.

On the following day the Bishop of Cashel sent a copy of his Charge to the Duke of Wellington ; who fully admitted, that there was nothing objectionable in it.

The Archbishop of Dublin took strange ground in supporting the Bill.

Lord de Ros supported it.

*The Bishop of Exeter* opposed it—but was considered, in one part of his speech, to be taking as strange ground in opposing it, as the Archbishop of Dublin had done in advocating it.

Lord Brougham particularly remarked upon the inconsistency between the Bishop of Exeter and the other opponents of the Bill, and endeavoured to answer all the arguments that had been adduced against it.

The Noble and learned Lord made some remarkable and important admissions, which (with some other of his observations) should be taken in connexion with the reply which was given to them by the Rev. R. J. Mc'Ghee at Exeter Hall, on the following day.

On Wednesday, June the 4th,

*The Earl of Clancarty* supported the Amendment of Lord Roden.

The Duke of Cleveland supported the Bill.

Earl Spencer likewise advocated it.

So did the Bishop of Norwich, and said, "It was an experiment in the right direction."

But past experience shows it to be a wretched *experiment* indeed. The original institution of Maynooth was *an experiment*, which has totally and signally failed.

The Earl of Mornington hailed the Measure as the first step towards the regeneration of Ireland.

*Lord Colchester* opposed the Bill.

Lord Monteagle regarded the Measure as most important, and expected great benefit from it.

The Bishop of St. David's supported the Bill, because it was a conciliatory Measure.

*The Earl of Charleville* opposed the Bill.

Lord Stanley, in a speech of some length, replied to the various objections that had been urged against the Bill.

"If Students at Maynooth had been admitted to the society of the Jesuits, they were amenable to the Law; and if the Noble Earl, who asserted this, was cognisant of the fact, and desirous of proceeding against them, they were open to prosecution for a misdemeanour, and liable to banishment. For this purpose, inquiry was not necessary; inquiry would be altogether useless; but it would be more than useless—it would produce an incessant and daily increasing acerbity of Religious animosities among different classes of the Irish people. If he believed this Measure likely to injure the Irish Protestant Church, either in its temporalities or spiritual influence, he would not only have refused his assent to it, but have been the first to denounce and resist it to the uttermost. He did not think it necessary to injure the one in order to advance the other. He had been asked, whether the permanent Endowment of Maynooth would lead to the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Church. He said, that was no necessary, or even probable consequence of this Measure. The permanent Endowment of Maynooth would no more lead to the permanent Endowment of the Roman Catholic Church, than the annual Endowment of Maynooth led to the annual Endowment of that Church. He saw serious obstacles to the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Church, in the opinions, the feelings, and the prejudices of the people of this Country, and in the avowed opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy themselves; *but religious scruples would not be a serious obstacle with him on such a question.* He believed, if this Measure had any effect at all on the Religion of the Roman Catholics, it would be not to make more, but better, Catholics. No new principle was involved in this Bill; and the sum they were called on to pay was inconsiderable in comparison with the magnitude of the objects to be gained. The Government wished the Measure to be received in Ireland, not as the harbinger of future measures, but as an indication of their determination to treat with kindness, conciliation, and favour the Roman Catholics, as they did all their other fellow-citizens in Ireland. He believed it would be so received; he rejoiced to say it had been so received in that Country. It might not produce the gratitude of those fanatical firebrands of the Church, whom no justice would conciliate; or of those political agitators, who, from mercenary motives, preyed on the distresses of their Country; but it would secure the gratitude of those, through whom was our nearest road to the hearts and affections of the people. He had too high a sense of the wisdom, justice, and patriotism of their Lordships to doubt the issue."

Their Lordships then divided on the Amendment—

Contents . . . . .	59
Not Content . . . . .	155
<hr/>	
Majority against it . . .	96

On the Motion—

Contents present . . . . .	144
Proxies . . . . .	82
<hr/>	
Total Contents . . . . .	226
Not Contents present . . . . .	55
Proxies . . . . .	14
<hr/>	
Total . . . . .	69
Majority in favour of the Second	<hr/>
Reading . . . . .	157

The House then adjourned at ten minutes past four o'clock.

The *Record* made the following just remarks on this Discussion :—

“The Second Reading of the Maynooth Endowment Bill passed the House of Lords this morning at four o'clock, after a debate of three nights, by a majority of 157! the numbers being, *Content*, 226; *Not Content*, 69.

“For some time past, we have understood the Minority would be weak. And, when we consider that the whole influence of the so-called Conservative Government was exerted with the Conservative Lords to obtain their votes; that the Whig and Liberal Peers voted nearly to a man in favour of the Measure; and, above all, that so great a proportion of the Episcopal Bench gave their influence, and many of them (as we must consider it) prostituted their office and talents to vindicate, in their places, this permanent Endowment, by a Protestant Government, of a Popish College,—and *this* preparatory, by general admission, to the Endowment of the Popish priesthood,—the result, however much the subject of regret, is not calculated to excite surprise.

“The Bishop of Exeter's opposition was not so much to the succouring and teaching of Popery by this Protestant people, as to the peculiarly objectionable method in which it was inculcated at Maynooth. Let Popery be taught by the Nation, not in *one* place, in the secret and secluded style of Maynooth; but in *three* Colleges,—in different parts of Ireland, in a more liberal and gentlemanly manner, and his Lordship had little objection. We need make no observations on such views as these.

“The Archbishop of Dublin attempted to point out the inconsistency of those, who objected to this permanent Endowment of Popery, and not to other Endowments of it, less permanent, or subsisting in other directions. But the parties to whom his Lordship refers have ever objected to the whole of these; the intensity of their opposition has only been quickened by the intensity of the danger. And so in relation to what his Grace said, of the money proposed to be given not being the money of *Protestants*, but the money of the NATION;—the question is not a question of money,—no one, who has a true glimpse of the question, regards it as such. But whether the Protestant Nation, receiving from God the inestimable treasure of

His Word, not only to hold but to disseminate, are justified in cherishing and endowing that which they believe to be idolatrous error?"

The following List of the Division was published in the Newspapers at the time; but it does not appear, that any authentic Lists of Division are ever printed by the House of Lords: nor are the documents, which are printed by that House, like those of the Lower House, accessible to the public at large. We have not, therefore, the same warrant for the accuracy of the List.

## MAJORITY, PRESENT, 155.

ARCHBISHOP.	Glasgow	Ripon
Dublin	Cowper	Yarborough
DUKES.	Waldegrave	Zetland
Cambridge	Warwick	Auckland
Norfolk	Fitzwilliam	Ellenborough
St. Alban's	Hardwicke	Bruce
Leeds	Delawarr	VISCOUNTS.
Rutland	Spencer	Strathallan
Hamilton	Bathurst	Torrington
Buccleuch	Clarendon	Sydney
Roxburghe	Fortescue	Strangford
Leinster	Beverley	Midleton
Wellington	Carnarvon	Gage
Cleveland	Liverpool	Hawarden
MARQUISES.	Malmesbury	Lake
Winchester	Meath	Canning
Huntly	Bessborough	Canterbury
Lansdowne	Mornington	Ponsonby
Salisbury	Charlemont	BISHOPS.
Abercorn	Kingston	Durham
Donegal	Clanwilliam	Norwich
Headfort	Wicklow	St. David's
Camden	Clare	Worcester
Londonderry	Leitrim	Chichester
Ormonde	Lucan	BARONS.
Clanricarde	Kenmare	Lyndhurst
Westminster	Rosslyn	Stanley
Normanby	Chichester	De Ros
EARLS.	Wilton	Clinton
Devon	Powis	Camoys
Essex	Gosford	Beaumont
Shaftesbury	Rosse	Byron
Scarborough	Lonsdale	Saltoun
Jersey	St. Germans	Belhaven
Haddington	Morley	Montford
Dalhousie	Somers	Foley
Leven	Stradbroke	Walsingham
Selkirk	Cawdor	Suffield
Aberdeen	Munster	Braybrooke
Rosebery	Burlington	Thurlow

Lyttelton  
Calthorpe  
Carington  
Bolton  
Lilford  
Rossmore  
Crofton  
Gardner  
Alvanley  
Redesdale  
Rivers  
Erskine  
Crewe  
Manners

Glenlyon  
Delamere  
Forester  
Downes  
Wharncliffe  
Tenterden  
Brougham  
Talbot of Malahide  
Templemore  
Dinorben  
Denman  
Carew  
Abinger  
Ashburton

Glenelg  
Hatherton  
Stafford  
Cottenham  
Langdale  
Bateman  
Wrottesley  
Leigh  
Lurgan  
Colborne  
De Freyne  
Monteagle of Brandon  
Campbell  
Vivian

## PROXIES—MAJORITY, 82.

## DUKES.

Bedford  
Devonshire  
Portland  
Northumberland  
Sutherland

## MARQUISES.

Tweedale  
Sligo  
Northampton  
Anglesey  
Bristol

## EARLS.

Pembroke  
Huntingdon  
Denbigh  
Westmoreland  
Lindsey  
Abingdon  
Albemarle  
Poulett  
Erroll  
Eglintoun  
Home  
Lauderdale  
Balcarras  
Tankerville  
Macclesfield  
Harrington

Buckinghamshire  
Talbot  
Mount Edgecumbe  
Cork  
Fingall  
Courtoun  
Sefton  
Donoughmore  
Harrowby  
Minto  
Cathcart  
Glengall  
De Grey  
Howe  
Amherst  
Camperdown  
Granville  
Ducie  
Leicester

## VISCOUNTS.

Massareene  
Melbourne  
Doneraile  
St. Vincent  
Melville

## BARONS.

Dacre  
Stourton  
Berners

Vaux  
Petre  
Arundel  
Stafford  
Clifford  
Rollo  
Polwart  
Carteret  
Montagu  
Cloncurry  
Clonbrock  
Dunally  
Prudhoe  
Howden  
Ravensworth  
De Tabley  
Cowley  
Stuart de Rothsay  
Heytesbury  
Poltimore  
Godolphin  
Lovat  
De Mauley  
Methuen  
Beauvale  
Stanley of Alderley  
Stuart de Decies  
Wenlock  
Seaton

## MINORITY PRESENT, 59.

## DUKES.

Grafton  
Manchester  
Newcastle

## MARQUISES.

Downshire  
Exeter

Cholmondeley  
Breadalbane

## EARLS.

Winchilsea



Kinnoull	Sheffield	Exeter
Mansfield	Eldon	Peterborough
Digby	Effingham	Lichfield
Cadogan	VISCOUNTS.	Cashel
Egmont		BARONS.
Roden	Maynard	
Bandon	Sidmouth	Willoughby de Broke
Caledon	Lorton	Sinclair
Onslow	Combermere	Southampton
Romney	Hill	Grantley
Clancarty	BISHOPS.	Kenyon
Nelson		Bayning
Charleville	Winchester	Farnham
Manvers	Lincoln	Sandys
Orford	Bangor	Colchester
Harewood	Carlisle	Rayleigh
Brownlow	Llandaff	Bexley
Beauchamp	Chester	Feversham
	Oxford	
	Gloucester	

## PROXIES—MINORITY, 14.

ARCHBISHOPS.		EARLS.	BISHOPS.
Canterbury		Guildford	London
York		Mountcashel	St. Asaph
DUKE.		Longford	Ripon
Marlborough		Bradford	BARON.
MARQUISES.		VISCOUNT.	
Ely		O'Neill	
Westmeath			

## PAIRS.

FOR.—Morton, Earl; Aylesford, Earl; Willoughby d'Eresby, Lord; Portman, Lord.

AGAINST.—Dunraven, Earl; Dartmouth, Earl; Beaufort, Duke; Gainsborough, Earl.

Lord Strangford voted in the Majority against Lord Roden's motion for the appointment of a Select Committee, and afterwards in the Minority against the Bill.

On Wednesday, June 4th, while this Discussion was still unfinished in the House of Lords, the proposed Meeting, for the purpose of addressing the Queen, was held in Exeter Hall.

The Hall was not so well filled as we had seen it on other occasions, but there was a much larger proportion of the male sex than is usually observable at Exeter Hall Meetings. The desire of the Committee had been, indeed, to have an Evening Meeting; but some circumstances, beyond their control, prevented this. All the Evening Meetings were thronged. But it may be well to keep in mind in future, that, when Meetings are multiplied, it is not possible, in this busy Metropolis, for all who wish to attend, to sacrifice the middle of the day, and all its business hours, to attendance upon Meetings, however interesting and important. They have daily duties to perform, and engagements, in which others are concerned, to fulfil, which compel them to be absent, when their hearts' desire would lead them to be present.

The Right Hon. the Earl of Winchilsea occupied the Chair ; and on the platform near him were Lord Kenyon, Mr. Plumptre, M.P., Mr. J. D. Paul, Mr. J. J. Cummins, Mr. R. C. L. Bevan, Mr. A. Moore, Dr. Stuart, Dr. Crawford, Revs. R. W. Dibdin, R. J. M'Ghee, A. S. Thelwall, Jabez Burns, Dr. Dixon, Dr. Cumming, S. R. Hall, W. Chalmers, James Hamilton, C. Day, G. Campbell, Hunt, &c.

"The Noble CHAIRMAN, in opening the proceedings, said, that if, under any circumstances, he should feel himself little qualified to address so large a Meeting, he felt this peculiarly, when he considered the important principles which had called them together. His heart was too full for utterance. England had indeed lived to see a fearful day ; and if the spirits of their forefathers had any cognizance of what was passing in this nether world, what would be their opinion of their degenerate children, who had cast from them the great Religious principles which had been bequeathed to them by their parents, and upon which had been based the Government and the Constitution of the Country—a Government and Constitution which, under the blessing of God, had made England the greatest and happiest of nations? (Cheers.) Awful indeed was the present state of the Country ; but his and their consolation would be, that they were not participators in the measures which went directly to the subversion of the Protestant Religion, and of Protestant Institutions in Church and State. (Cheers.) He believed that nearly 10,000 Petitions had been presented against this Measure, signed by upwards of 1,208,000 persons—a number exceeding that of all the Electors of the United Kingdom. Were they then to be told, that the Government was to carry a Measure of this nature, by which the British Constitution would be endangered? (Cheers.) They had met, then, as their last resort, for the purpose of voting an Address to our gracious Sovereign, praying Her Majesty to uphold those principles upon which were founded the Constitution of the Country, and all our blessings and greatness as a Nation. (Cheers.) After some further remarks, his Lordship said, that if those principles were persevered in, England should find in him the greatest agitator that ever lived ; he would fight with them the battle of the faith. (Cheers.) At the next Dissolution of Parliament, let them return as their Representatives honest Protestant Members. (Cheers.) They should extend their bond of union to every County, to every Borough Town of England ; and he promised that he would do all in his power, to promote the establishment of a Protestant Club, in support of the Protestant principles of the British Constitution, and to elevate the social and moral position of the people of this Country. (Cheers.) He would not allow this great Religious feeling to subside, till Protestant England had asserted her character again. Let them persevere in their determination, and fear not,—relying that, if sincere and earnest in their prayers that the eyes of those now so blinded might be opened,—the fearful judgment might be averted from them, which must fall upon them, if they abandoned their duty to their Country and their duty to their God at this most awful crisis. (Loud cheers.)"

Mr. Lord, the Secretary, then read letters from the Earl of Roden, from the Rev. M. O'Sullivan, D.D., from Dr. Morison, and Dr. Bunting, apologizing for their inability to attend. The Noble Earl stated illness as the cause, and all concurred in expressing their warmest sympathy with the object of the Meeting.

The following Resolutions were then unanimously adopted :—

Moved by the Right Hon. Lord Kenyon ; seconded by J. J. Cummins, Esq. :

“ I. That the Bill for the Endowment of the Romish College of Maynooth, will essentially change the British Constitution, and tend to undermine the foundation of the Throne, and to endanger the free profession of the Protestant faith.”

Moved by J. P. Plumptre, Esq., M.P. ; seconded by the Rev. John Cumming, D.D. :

“ II. That the revenues of this Protestant Country ought not to be employed for the support and propagation of doctrines and practices which are superstitious and idolatrous.”

Moved by the Rev. W. Arthur ; seconded by the Rev. R. J. M'Ghee :

“ III. That the following Petition be adopted and presented to the Queen, most humbly and urgently imploring her Majesty to withhold her Royal Assent from any Bill for the Endowment of a Romish College, until her Majesty shall, by the Dissolution of Parliament, have granted to her loyal people the opportunity of pronouncing their deliberate judgment upon such a momentous change in the fundamental principles of the British Constitution.”

#### “ TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

“ Most Gracious Sovereign,

“ We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, being Protestant inhabitants of your ancient Capital, in approaching the footstool of your Throne, humbly beg leave to express our unshaken fidelity to your Majesty's Royal person and family, and our firm adherence to those Protestant principles which placed the illustrious ancestors of your Majesty on the Throne of these Realms.

“ We beg most humbly and respectfully to remind your Majesty of the declaration made by your Majesty, on your happy accession to the Crown, that you ‘ had learned from your infancy to respect and love the Constitution of your native Country,’ and that your Majesty ‘ would make it your unceasing study to maintain the Reformed Religion as by Law established, securing, at the same time, to all, the full enjoyment of Religious liberty.’

“ That Constitution assumes the existence of some community of interests, and some agreement in judgment and in feeling, between those who legislate for the people, and the people for whom they legislate ; but we are grieved to state to your Majesty, that the present Representatives of the Commons of England have passed a Bill for the permanent Endowment of the College of Maynooth, for the training of Romish priests ; and this they have done, confessedly, in opposition to the Religious convictions of the people, as respectfully declared in above ten thousand Petitions, signed by nearly thirteen hundred thousand of your Majesty's loyal and devoted subjects.

“ That Bill, besides providing for the maintenance and education, from the public revenue, of 520 students in Romish doctrines, provides also, that the President, Vice-President, Officers, and Professors of that College, who teach the doctrines and discipline of the Church of Rome, shall become the recognised servants of the Crown and permanent stipendiaries of the State—a Measure which, in our most deliberate and solemn judgment, essentially changes the British Constitution, tends to undermine the foundation of the Throne, and endanger the free profession of the Protestant faith.

"We beg most humbly, yet most emphatically to assure your Majesty, that our opposition to this Measure does not arise from a wish to deprive any of our fellow-subjects of their rightful privileges as citizens; but from an unconquerable repugnance to the employment of the revenues of this Protestant Country, for the support and propagation of doctrines and practices, which your Majesty has solemnly declared to be 'superstitious and idolatrous.'

"We feel it, therefore, to be our bounden duty to Almighty God, and to your Majesty, most humbly and urgently to implore your Majesty, to withhold your Royal Assent from any such Bill, until your Majesty, by the Dissolution of Parliament, shall have granted to your loyal people, the opportunity of pronouncing their deliberate judgment upon such a momentous change in the fundamental principles of the British Constitution.

"And your Memorialists will ever pray, that it may please Almighty God to endue your Majesty with all heavenly gifts, and grant you in health and wealth long to live, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Moved by A. Moore, Esq.; seconded by the Rev. A. S. Thelwall:

"IV. That the Right Hon. the Earl of Winchilsea be requested to sign such Petition on behalf of this Meeting, and to present it to her Majesty."

Moved by the Right Hon. Lord Cavan; seconded by T. Thompson, Esq., of Poundsford Park:

"V. That the best thanks of the Meeting be given to the Right Hon. the Earl of Winchilsea, for his persevering and uncompromising exertions on behalf of Protestant Truth; and particularly for his kindness in supporting the efforts of this Committee by taking the Chair on this occasion."

From the Speech of the Rev. John Cumming, as the representative of the Established Church of Scotland on this occasion, it may be desirable to insert a few extracts. He said—

"I am most anxious, that it should be clearly understood, and deeply impressed upon this great assembly, that, in moving on this important question, we are actuated by no enmity to the persons of Roman Catholics. On the contrary, I believe, that it is the almost unanimous feeling, that, whilst we abhor and detest their principles, we are ready to suffer and to sacrifice for the welfare of their souls. I believe, that, just in the ratio in which we detest the Creed, we love the men that subscribe it. It is most important, that, if any Roman Catholic is present, he should feel, that our opposition to this Measure is not an opposition to *men* in the Protestant State or in the Romish Church, but to *measures*; and that it is because we are, by solemn conviction, and on Scripture grounds, opposed to Romish principles, that we are anxious they should not be sustained and spread by the Endowments of the Nation.

"I am also desirous, that we should, as much as possible, abstain from all that may trench upon internal disputes. I have seen in the Committee room to-day, complaints upon this subject in *The Patriot* newspaper. It is important, that we should merge every ripple on the surface in one great flood of opposition to the principle of this Measure. And I must say, that the conduct of the Dissenters on this question has been most proper; it has been worthy of the Owens, the Howes, and the Baxters of old. If I were a Dissenter, and actuated by a hostility to the Esta-

blished Churches, greater than my love to my Saviour and my Bible, I should have supported the Maynooth Endowment Bill; because I should have argued, that, if Sir Robert Peel endowed two antagonistic Churches in Ireland, like an acid and an alkali, they would neutralize one another, and the issue would be—no Established Church at all. But, while I believe, that the Measure is calculated to sweep from beneath our feet the foundation principles on which a Church Establishment can be most successfully defended, I feel the more delighted with the conduct of those, who have merged their Dissent in their Protestantism, and joined heart and hand in this righteous movement.

“I gave a glance at the newspaper reports of the debates in the House of Lords this morning; and I read, not with surprise, but with considerable pain, the speech of a noble and learned lord, who is half a countryman of my own—I mean Lord Brougham. In the course of that speech, he makes the most wanton and gratuitous attack upon Calvin,—as unjust to the dead Reformer, as it was unworthy of the living Baron. I wish his lordship would read Calvin before he criticizes him; and then, I am sure, he will not repeat his own too celebrated aphorism, ‘that a man is no more accountable for his Creed, than for the colour of his skin or the height of his stature.’ His lordship draws a contrast between Thomas Aquinas and John Calvin; and he comes to the most extraordinary conclusion, (perhaps not extraordinary, however, from *him*,) that, of the twain, John Calvin was rather the worse. Now I have read a considerable portion of the writings of John Calvin; and I have read the *Secunda Secunda*—a very choice portion of the writings of Thomas Aquinas; and the contrast between them is just the contrast between liberty and slavery, between truth and a lie, between love and bloodshed, between light and darkness, between heaven and hell. His lordship is a learned man; he has read a great deal, and written a great deal, and *said* a great deal more; but if ‘the bray of Exeter Hall’ should reach his illustrious ear, I would venture to suggest to him, that his argument is not quite logical. If he can show us a Collect in the Anglican Prayer-book, or refer to an authorized extemporaneous prayer by any Clergyman of the Church of Scotland, or Minister of any Secession or Dissenting body in Christendom,—praying, that we may imitate the example, and imbibe and preach the principles of Calvin, *then* he may hold us, in some measure, responsible for Calvin’s sentiments. But he can point to no such thing. But I can prove this to be the homage given to Aquinas in the Roman Church. So truly does the Romish Church approve the persecuting dogmas inculcated in the writings of Aquinas, that all her members pray, on the seventh of March in every year: ‘O God, who, by the wonderful learning of blessed Thomas, Thy confessor, hast illustrated Thy Church, and by his virtues hast enlarged it; grant, we beseech Thee, that we *may understand* what Thomas Aquinas *taught*, and *in our lives follow* what Thomas Aquinas *practised*.’ Will his lordship tell me, in reply, on what day Protestants pray to be enabled thus to follow John Calvin? Protestants follow Calvin, as far as Calvin followed Christ; Romanists follow the beatified Thomas absolutely. But besides, the solitary sin to which Calvin was accessory, was not the sin of directly preaching persecution, and advocating it in the case of Servetus, but of acquiescing in the previously existing law of Geneva, which condemned him to death for his blasphemous creed. Neither did Calvin teach principles of persecution in his Creed; nor, if he did (having just emerged from a persecuting apostasy) are *we* responsible for what Calvin taught. All his sins were the sins of humanity—his excellences were drawn from the Word of God; a generous mind would forgive and lose the one, in the splendour and the glory of the other.

"But it has been supposed, by some of the advocates of a new course of treatment of Romanism, that the Establishment or the Endowment of a bad system is one of the great prescriptions for curing all its errors. Attaching as I do, personally, vast practical value to the principle of a National Establishment, I never could so far worship it and exalt it. Two years ago, I went up the Rhine, part of the way in company with my friend Mr. Plumptre,—after I had travelled through Belgium, where the Church of Rome is established by law and liberally maintained,—with an archiepiscopal seminary at Malines, probably the model from which Maynooth is about to be constructed; and it is natural to ask—has the Establishment of Popery done *there* what Sir R. Peel is sponsor for its doing *here*? It has not. In no country did I see the human mind so prostrate; never did I behold superstition so dense; never did I so clearly see, that, if the Spirit of God do not eradicate the seeds and dissipate the clouds of Popery, all the Acts of all the Parliaments and States of Europe will not. They will fall upon it like rain drops upon Etna, likely to fan, but utterly unable to extinguish it. In wandering through Belgium, I spent day after day, from five in the morning till eight at night, in the Churches; I was at matins, and vespers, and mid-day mass. I found, in every one of the exquisite Churches and great Cathedrals, a huge statue of the virgin Mary, about five feet ten inches in height, cut in oak, and clothed in beautiful blue satin,—trimmed with Mechlin or Valenciennes lace, with the best French kid gloves upon her hands, and a rod or symbol of authority in her right hand, together with a crown upon her head; and, from morning till night, I saw the Belgians, some of them evidently belonging to the better classes, hurrying into the Churches, kneeling before this idol, and giving it the homage of their hearts and the ascriptions of their tongues. I have here one of the popular prints of this idol; it represents the virgin Mary, with her foot upon the serpent's head—intended to illustrate the text—'*She shall bruise thy head.*'"

\* \* \* \* \*

"But I will not dwell upon the characteristics of that unhappy land; I will only say, that it is matter of too notorious observation, that the fostering care of Government has not produced any amelioration of Roman Catholic principles or practices beyond the channel. Romanism remains in Belgium, what its canons make it—a system which displaces the atonement of God by the atonement of man,—the worship of Jesus by the worship of the Virgin; which puts a padlock on the Bible, and punishes the cottager who reads it, and confiscates the property of the bookseller who sells it, which incorporates all deadly error, and excludes all the precious and renovating principles which emanate from God, and are embodied in the Oracles of everlasting Truth. It is not because it is an *anti-social system*, that I so much deprecate its Endowment; it is because it *dishonours God*, and ruins precious souls. It is not her crimes against my Country, but her blasphemies against my God, that I condemn. As a Minister of the everlasting Gospel, I would scarcely come upon this platform, to protest against its anti-social tendencies; but, zealous for the glory of the great Head of the Church, I come here and protest, in the Name of God and of all that is sacred, against any National recognition of its awful conspiracy against the glory of heaven and the salvation of souls; its eclipse of the one, its ruin of the other. This, my Christian friends, is too solemn a thing for you to receive with bursts of cheering; it is a very grave and a very awful matter, that the Parliament

---

\* This is the Popish version of Gen. iii. 15.—EDITOR.

of mighty England should, to any extent, form itself into an auxiliary to the Propaganda, for maintaining this terrible system.

"I have spoken of its superstition and idolatry. May I briefly illustrate it? I hold in my hand a book, which I obtained after persevering search—the celebrated Psalter of St. Bonaventure; for whom, as well as Aquinas, there is a special Collect in the Missal. In the Psalms, edited by this Cardinal Saint, you have the Name of God expunged in every instance, and the name of the Virgin introduced in its place. As in Psalm xcvi.: 'Oh! come, let us sing unto our Lady; let us heartily rejoice in the Virgin that brings us salvation; let us come before her presence with thanksgiving, and show ourselves glad in her with Psalms.' Psalm li. is—'Have mercy upon me, O Lady, who art called the Mother of mercy; and according to thy great compassions blot out all mine iniquities.' It opens in the preface with—'Come unto Mary, all ye that are weary and heavy laden; and she will give you rest.' Then there is that beautiful hymn in the Anglican Prayer-Book, but which belongs to the Church universal,—for it was composed and sung before the Church of England was endowed—namely, the *Te Deum*; which is made to run thus—'We praise thee, O Mary, we acknowledge thee to be the Virgin; all the earth doth worship thee, the spouse of the Eternal; to thee all angels cry aloud, Holy, holy, holy art thou, O Mary, Mother of God.' I know that some object to what is called the Athanasian Creed; but I presume they will not be reconciled by the version of it presented by Bonaventure—'Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he have a firm faith concerning Mary,' &c. The Litany of the saint runs in the same way—'Spare us, O Lady; from all evil and mischief, deliver us, O Lady.' I recollect a clause in the English Litany, which made a deep impression upon me, when I first came to England, and went for the first time into a parish Church, and heard its sublime language, not read, but prayed—'In all time of our tribulation, in all time of our wealth, in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment, Good Lord, deliver us'—words worthy of a Christian to pray, and of a Church to prescribe; but, in this execrable version in my hand, I find it thus caricatured—'In the hour of death, and in the day of judgment, from all evil, and from the torments of the damned, good Mary, deliver us.' Now this is a book, the teaching of the principles and practices of which we are to endow. But you say—'It is an obsolete document.' I have ten successive editions of the Psalter and *Te Deum*, published at Rome, between 1831 and 1840—under the sanction of the present Pope, and all the authorities of the Vatican. I have these editions in Latin, and in Italian; and with all the authority it is possible for the Church of Rome to impress upon any document that comes out under her auspices. Shall we aid this blasphemous teaching, this heinous idolatry? Shall we concur in Nationally endowing what dishonours God, and involves the destinies of souls throughout eternity?

\* \* \* \* \*

"I rejoice exceedingly, that there is not a Christian body, which has not stood forth, by great majorities, against the Endowment of this system. The Church of England—notwithstanding some episcopal and presbyterial defaulters—has, on the whole, given a sound Protestant opposition to this National dereliction of duty. The Church of Scotland, to which I belong, resolved the other day, in the General Assembly, by a majority of 187 to 41, to petition against it; and of the minority of 41 in the General Assembly, (composed chiefly, I believe, of lay elders,) there was not one, that ventured to say he approved of the principle on which the Measure is based. I rejoice to say, that not only have the two Establishments thus acted; but, among Nonconformists, that active and zealous body, the Free Secession Church,

has acted very much in the same way. Common principles are in jeopardy. When I, a minister of the Established Church, am tied to one faggot in Smithfield, and my friend Mr. Hamilton, of the Free Secession Church, to another, the flame that consumes us will show, how microscopic were the points on which we differed—how majestic and glorious the Truths on which we are agreed. The Wesleyans too, another Nonconformist body, have acted nobly. I envy them the abuse they have received; I never was so tempted to become a Wesleyan, as when I read, that Daniel O'Connell, that composite of Nero and Nebuchadnezzar—feeling his power to be shaken a little—wrote an abusive letter about the Wesleyans, on one side; and when Lord Brougham, seeing a powerful demonstration roused against Maynooth, waxed furious against the Wesleyans—though he must have forgotten some of his theology last night, when he attacked them under the misnomer of Calvinists. Throughout the whole of this matter, they have taken a most prominent part; I thank them—I hail them as brethren; we are brethren in arms, and rivals only in renown. Our Independent and Baptist brethren also have fought nobly. God grant that this union, begun under so favourable auspices, and cemented round the altars of our father-land, may never be dissolved in feeling or sympathy, until the Church in grace be lost in the Church in glory—the Church militant in the splendour of a cloudless millennial morn—and the Church of Britain has become the Church of mankind!

“It has been earnestly urged, that the Measure will produce peace. I value peace, and I wish it universally prevailed; but peace, let it be remembered, is not a root—it is only a product. Truth is the stem—peace is the blossom. Cut off the blossom, and the stem will bear the accents of returning spring, and again throw forth beauteous buds, to be unfolded in more beauteous blossoms; but cut down the stem, eradicate the root, and no sun will make bud or blossom appear any more. Sir Robert Peel is trying to produce peace without truth—the blossom without the stem. And even peace may be purchased at too high a price. If the Endowment of Popery be eventually the disendowment of one Church in Ireland, and the extermination, in the long run, of all the others—I fear we shall find our Irish peace purchased at too dear a rate. Ireland must be Protestant before it be peaceful. The God of heaven has pronounced its character—‘they say, Peace, peace, when there is no peace.’

“It has been argued also, that there is an overwhelming majority of Roman Catholics in Ireland; and the Creed of the overwhelming majority we ought to endow. I confess, my Lord, that the most startling part of this whole subject, is not the Measure itself, but *the infidel principles* broached in the discussion. If the principle of a National Establishment depends for its existence solely on majorities, it is not worth keeping up for another twelvemonth. It is indefensible. But Truth depends upon no such basis. If the whole of this hall were to catch some dreadful inspiration of the damned, and to cry out, with fearful infatuation, and with unanimous shout, that Popery is truth; and if but one child stood forth in that gallery at the other end, and exclaimed, that Popery is false, and Protestantism true; that child would be right, and the whole hall would be wrong. We do not count heads for orthodoxy—we appeal to texts alone. Truth remains truth, when we must follow her to the stake; falsehood remains falsehood, when all the riches of the earth are piled upon her altars, and the embroidery of the world is heaped upon her shrines. ‘To the law, and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them.’

“It has been urged, that the Church of Rome merely holds a little more than we



do, and that as she embraces all that we hold, she must have as great a chance of salvation as we have. This may be mathematics, but it is not morals. You are aware, that the most celebrated and authoritative formulary of that Church is the Creed of Pope Pius IV.; the first twelve articles of it constitute the Nicene Creed, and belong to the year 325; the last twelve articles of it constitute the Popish creed, strictly so called, and belong to the year 1564. It is perfectly true, that both Churches do hold the Nicene Creed. But here is the difference—*we* receive the articles of that creed in order to believe them, but *she* welcomes them as Jael welcomed the traveller—to pin him to the earth and destroy him. Herein is ‘the mystery of iniquity.’ She shows you twelve panes of glass, and bids you mark how the rays of the sun pour into the room through them; and when she has introduced you, she puts twelve shutters upon them, and leaves you to the dim lights of her traditions. She shows you twelve tumblers of pure water, taken from a good spring; but then she lets fall into them twelve drops of prussic acid. Most pure, no doubt, is the water; but such is the virus of the additional element, that it neutralizes and poisons the whole.

“It is said, that Popery is now a changed Religion, and that it is absurd to rake up obsolete canons, and fling them in the face of the modern Church of Rome. This argument involves the admission, that the Church of Rome has been something worse than we see it now. But it overlooks the fact, that her canons are stereotyped. She is a fixture. She is infallible; she is, therefore, unchangeable. Prove to her people, that one stone has fallen from her arch, that one article of her faith has been repealed, and you prove that she has ceased to be, what she pretends to be—infallible; and thus the main element of her witchery is gone. I know, the Roman Catholic will thank you for saying she is changed; but he laughs in his sleeve at your folly, and pockets the fruits of your delusion. He believes that she has undergone no change; that she remains, in her persecuting principles, the same as when Dominus Dens lighted his fires in Ireland, or Dominick his in Spain. *Semper eadem* is her motto; or, to give you the Irishman’s translation of that phrase, as he applied it to his wife, ‘she gets worsen and worsen.’

“But I beg you to bear in mind, that a new principle is now introduced in National policy—a new movement, in a new direction, prolific of new and ominous results; or, as Mr. Sheil called it—‘the first of a series of new measures towards Ireland.’ Do you think, that if Maynooth gets £26,000 a year, Stonyhurst and Oscott will be quiet, or ought to be quiet? No; they will come to the Government,—especially in a day when one sin is made the pretext and pioneer for another, and they will ask for an Endowment,—not then as liberality, but as equal justice. You are opening a door, which will be crowded with applicants, no longer suppliant for boons, but thundering for rights. And as for Rome, she must be all, if she be anything—*aut Cæsar aut nil*.

“Another plea has been adduced, that this Endowment will give a better education to the Irish priests. Mr. Roebuck, in one of his *excursus* in the Commons, said, that if they were Hindoos or Mahomedans, he would educate them by National Endowments in their respective creeds. He would educate the Trinitarians in the faith, that ‘Christ is God;’ he would educate the Socinian in the scepticism, that ‘Christ is not God.’ He would teach the Romanist to worship the Virgin Mary; and he would educate the Protestant to pronounce it idolatry. What limit could be assigned to such liberality? In what would he not educate humanity? Only teach, and it is of no consequence whether it be falsehood, fanaticism, or folly!

“But will the education at Maynooth really improve the rising priests? Will it

be education in the truths of the Bible, or in the fables of the Breviary? in holy ethics, or in the immoralities of Bailly, and the anti-social dogmas of Thomas Aquinas? It may be in anything, and in any way; for so little control is the State to have over teacher or lesson, that, as it has been stated, in order not to spoil the 'grace' of the Measure, England shall merely stand at the door of Maynooth, holding a bag, into which the priests may dig their digitals, and help themselves. They may teach the principles of murder, sedition, privy conspiracy, rebellion,—still the State will apply no check, and exercise no control. England must be merely the dumb purse-bearer of Maynooth. If it be just to pay for teaching Jesuitism in 1845, it was wrong to expel the Jesuits in 1829.

"It has been urged, that Maynooth is very poor, and therefore we ought to help it on the ground of charity. Thus, Romanism can either demand as a right, or sue and supplicate as a boon. Will not Tuam, and Waterford, and Carlow, soon find out their poverty also? But the Irish Romanists send about £1,000 a month to the Propaganda, and contribute about £400 a week to O'Connell, and the cause of Repeal. Does this look like poverty?

"It is said, that this Endowment will make the priests loyal. The almost inviolable rule of former times, was to reward men *because* they were loyal; the new process, strange as it may appear, would seem to be, to reward seditious men, in order *to make* them loyal. Does the warm embrace of the State generate loyalty in rebels? Is the Irish loyalty a marketable article? Does loyalty leap into the priest's heart the moment the State stipend descends into his pocket? But if this new plan is tried at Maynooth, may not the rogues in the Old Bailey be paid so much a head, in order to make them honest? Thus, neither *prevention*—the prescription of Christian philanthropists; nor *punishment*—the preference of statesmen; but *payment* is the grand *panacea* for eradicating all moral evils, and fostering the contrary virtues! Endow Maynooth, and, lo! Luthers and Knoxes will go forth from its cloisters; endow Botany Bay, and Howards and Ashleys will start up in it, while its desert acres will blossom as the rose! Out on such fooleries!

"I trust we are not approximating to the example of France, in which all religions are endowed. Surely the fruits that France has borne, do not commend her as a precedent in this. A restless populace, and a rocking throne, are emphatically hers. Do we envy this? I must say, that rather than acquiesce in the French system, which endows all sects and creeds—the teachers of idolatry, and the preachers of truth,—much as I love the Church of my fathers, I would say,—Perish both our Establishments to the very foundations. Such Endowment would not be *impartiality*—it would be *infidelity*; it would not be *liberality*—it would be *latitudinarianism*; and, attached as I am to the Church of Scotland, desirous (if God enable me) to live and die in that Church,—yet, if such attachment implied, as, thank God, it does not yet, approval of this principle, I would, with Mr. Hamilton, leave it. Such policy, I trust, we shall none of us live to see in the Councils of the Land; and such sacrifices will then be uncalled for.

"But, say some—'you have already endowed Episcopacy in England, and Presbytery in Scotland; and why not Romanism in Ireland?' The best reply will be the shortest: you have given Englishmen *wheaten bread*, and Scotchmen *oatmeal cakes*; and why not give Irishmen *arsenic*, or *prussic acid*? If Church Endowments be right, it is because they are the Endowments of Truth. On no inferior ground can any such National support of a Church be worthy of defence.

"It is, surely, (I put it to Protestant statesmen,) a painful consideration, that we are asked to contribute, through the channels of National support, to the manufactory

of priests, that they may spread like locusts throughout the Country ; and for the maintenance of a system, which infects the whole social atmosphere with suspiciousness—which sends an Argus-eyed police into all the relationships of life,—which poisons the well-springs of social being, and ultimately rouses the Nations that have suffered from its success, to pass penal enactments against it, in order to save themselves from utter prostration. You must never suffer the Church of Rome to become the Irish National Establishment, should such an attempt be made by any Party. Your illustrious Reformers watch you from their beds of glory. They adjure you, by their re-opening wounds, to be faithful—to hand down to your children, if not improved, at least not impaired, the blood-brought heritage they left you : and woe to our children, if we shrink from duty, because it may come once more to be set in perilous responsibility. We must yet learn to see in sainted martyrs, not phenomena, whose brilliant transit through the world proclaims their having been here ; but in each a projection only of our own soul, an ordinary model for us and others to imitate.

“ I rejoice to see, that this unhappy Measure is being overruled for good. It was thought, by some, that Protestantism was dead ; it turns out to have been only asleep,—culpably I admit, but yet only asleep. It waited for the stamp of some foot, firm and energetic enough to rouse it from its slumber. It waited till it heard a voice ‘sleep no more,’ and it arose, and now fills broad England with its enthusiasm, and we hope, ere long, wide Europe with its thunders. Like Samson, deceived and beguiled, it had been too long sleeping upon the lap of apathy : but it no sooner heard the shout, ‘The Philistines be upon thee,’ than it recollected the secret springs of its indomitable power, shook again its locks of strength, and put on its attributes of grandeur, its robes of victory. Let it now act. It will reimburse itself. Let its prescriptions be practically and powerfully displayed. I do not prescribe to you how to act in Elections, except so far as Moses does, whose criteria are sound. But this much I will say ; whether you vote for Tories or for Whigs, vote for none but sound-hearted Protestants.

“ Let me ask you too, not to be discouraged in this great controversy. You are too prone to be so. Irishmen will, Englishmen may, but we Scotchmen never ; we have a love to our Country, an attachment to our Church, and a loyalty to our Queen, that do not falter in the worst, nor weary in the best of times. Learn something of the spirit of a Highlander piper, who was taken prisoner by the French. Napoleon was struck with his mountain dress and his sinewy limbs, and asked him to play on his instrument, so unmusical in your Anglican ears, but which, I assure you, sounds magnificently in our glens and mountains and grey moors. ‘Play a pibroch,’ said Napoleon ; and the Highlander played it. ‘Play a march ;’ it was done. ‘Play a retreat ;’ ‘Na, na,’ said Donald, ‘I never learned to play a retreat.’ No Protestant retreat—I say ; play any march or movement you like, but no retreat !”

The Rev. R. J. M’Ghee, M.A., thus replied to some of the observations, which had been made by Lord Brougham, in the House of Lords, on the preceding evening :—

“ I have to offer an apology to your Lordship and this Meeting, for presuming to intrude upon your notice this day, without the least preparation for addressing you ; but I felt it my duty, to call the attention of those who are assembled here, to what I consider a very important document, that appeared in the *Times* of this morning—

a Speech attributed to Lord Brougham. I believe there is not an individual in England, who would more readily and more cheerfully assent to any investigation of any sentiments of his, than that noble and learned lord; I believe—as a constant and firm advocate of civil and religious liberty, public discussion, and the freedom of the people and the press,—there is no man in England, who would more gladly wish that we should enjoy that privilege; and, therefore, I only regret that I have not the pleasure of seeing him on this platform. I trust the day will come, when he will feel it his duty and his privilege, to stand forward and take a bold and prominent part, in asserting the Civil and Religious Liberties of his Country; as, I regret to say, he is now (most unconsciously, I am confident,) the advocate of Civil and Religious Slavery.

“I have just had time to note some part of the words, attributed in this paper to the noble and learned Lord.

“‘The Right Rev. Prelate had complained, that, under this Bill, there would be no security for the good government of the College of Maynooth. That was not the case. By this Bill, the trustees were made a corporation; and, as a corporation, they would have the power to make by-laws. They would also have the power to make, within certain limits, regulations as to doctrine. There were also visitors, who were bound to visit the College at certain times. The Right Rev. Prelate was in error, in stating that hitherto the visitation of the College had been ineffectual.’

“I thought, in reading this passage, that I really had not examined the Bill; and I opened it, to look at the passage where the provision alluded to by the noble and learned Lord is made. He says—‘They would also have the power to make, within certain limits, regulations as to doctrine.’ I turn to the Bill. ‘Provided always, and be it enacted, that the authority of the said visitors shall not extend to, or in any manner affect, the exercise of the Roman Catholic Religion, or the religious doctrine or discipline thereof, within the said College or Seminary, otherwise than as hereinafter is provided; and that, in visiting the said College or Seminary, the said Visitors shall judge and determine according to such by-laws, rules, and regulations, as have been or shall be made for the government and discipline thereof, pursuant to the provisions of the said recited Acts, or of this Act respectively.’ And what is it, that is ‘otherwise hereinafter provided?’ Why, ‘that in all matters which relate to the exercise, doctrine, and discipline of the Roman Catholic Religion, the visitatorial power over the said College shall be exercised exclusively, by such of the Visitors as are or shall be of the Roman Catholic Religion, in the presence of the other Visitors (appointed by her Majesty), if they or any of them shall think proper to attend.’

“What, then, is the provision of this Bill? That the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland—the Trustees of Maynooth—shall have the power of examining the pupils or the Professors, in the presence of the Judges and the Chancellor, in all matters which relate to the exercise, doctrine, and discipline of the Roman Catholic Religion. Let me ask, will those Most Rev. and Right Rev. Doctors bring forward the principles of their College before the Chancellor and the Judges, and ask the Professors, whether they teach *the violation of oaths*, and *intolerant and persecuting doctrines*, and *the doctrines of sedition*? Will such questions be asked by those individuals? or if they are, will these principles be acknowledged by the Professors and pupils of the College? Will those men elicit from the Professors and pupils of their College, in the presence of the Judges and the Chancellor, those principles, which they have themselves denied upon their oaths again and again—*falsely denied*—before the Committees of Parliament?

“Such is the provision made in the Bill for the Visitation of the College. But

I should not have presumed to notice any remarks upon this Bill generally, or to address this Meeting, if statements had not been brought forward, which involve the truth or falsehood of what had been alleged by me upon this platform; and, with the blessing of my God, so long as He is pleased to spare me health and strength, there is not a living man, from the lowest to the highest, in the British Empire, not a lord of Parliament nor a priest of the Church of Rome, that shall ever make a statement, which involves the falsehood of any that I have made, but I will stand forward boldly before this Nation, and reiterate and prove that statement as I can. I never stood upon this platform, without demanding, that the men, against whom the accusations made by me were brought, should come forward—or authorize persons in their name,—to meet and refute those statements, if they were able. Before I came over here on this occasion, I drew out, under the head of ten or twelve objections to this Bill, all the corrupt doctrines and evil practices taught at Maynooth; I sent that, before the public meeting in Dublin, to the President of Maynooth; and, hearing he was ill, I wrote to the Vice-President; and I called on them, if they were able to object to any of those statements of mine, to come forward in the Rotunda and do so. The gentlemen, however, have preserved a most profound and respectful silence.

“ I proceed to some of these statements of Lord Brougham, which involve the truth of those I have made.

“ On another occasion an inquiry was set on foot, as to whether it was taught in the College, that it was legitimate for the priests to refuse to give evidence in Courts of Justice, on the plea of being restrained by oaths. The answer was distinctly in the negative; it was stated, that it was the duty of Roman Catholics so situated, to answer on oath under such circumstances, notwithstanding any implied spiritual engagement.’

“ Now it is not necessary for me to enter into any statement, generally speaking, of the obligation of oaths in the Roman Catholic Church; there is another document, in this same Newspaper, in which there is a statement of another noble Lord, who has laid the principles of the Papacy on oaths faithfully before the British Parliament in the House of Peers; and that noble Lord is he, whom it is our privilege to have presiding over us this day. But the question here is, respecting the evidence of *priests* on oath; I therefore confine myself exclusively to that. I shall read to the Meeting the doctrine of Maynooth on that point.

“ ‘ If a priest should be interrogated by a magistrate, of those things which he knows only from Confession, he ought to answer that he is ignorant of them; yea, and to swear the same, without any danger of a falsehood (*absque ullo mendacii periculo*.) The reason is, according to Estius, because he who answers according to the mind of the person who asks him, neither tells a lie nor equivocates, and says nothing but the truth; but this is the state of the priest in the case aforesaid; for the Judge does not demand from him what he knows in the way of Confession, in which he exercises the part of God, but he asks him what he knows as man, and therefore out of Confession. All theologians agree with Estius.’ [*Delahogue, De Pœnitentiâ*, p. 292.] And so, because in the Confessional he plays the part of God, he comes out of the Confessional, and calls God to witness that he knows nothing at all about it!

“ Now this is not a book taken out of the range of Papal theology, and introduced into the College of Maynooth; but this is a book written by the Professor of Maynooth, printed for the College of Maynooth, and compiled by that man, to instruct and guide the pupils, who are instructed in that College.

“ But, since this is a doctrine taught in Maynooth, we will ask, how is this doctrine

exemplified? And I will not go to the Confessional; I will not investigate what priests have answered, who were examined respecting things taught or learned in the Confessional; but points in which, not only Roman Catholic priests, but Roman Catholic Bishops, have been examined, on their oath, on things which they did not know by Confession: and you shall hear the influence of this doctrine on those gentlemen. Here is the evidence given by Dr. Doyle before the Committee of the House of Lords in 1825, on the subject of the permission of the reading of the Scriptures in Ireland—a subject in which I trust the Protestants of England will take a deep and anxious interest.

“ ‘Have you heard, or have you any knowledge, that the sacraments of the Church have been refused to those who have been in possession of the books (Bibles and Testaments), and have not delivered them up, in consequence of the admonition?’ ‘I have not heard of any such thing; before your Lordships and before God, I never did.’ ‘Could it have been done in any part of Ireland, and you not know it?’ ‘I think it might; and I am quite sure that there are persons among our clergy, of so warm and heated feelings, as to do precisely what has been stated; but I have stated before, I do not know of its being done; but it might have been done, I am quite sure, considering the character of some of our young clergy, and old ones too: we have enthusiasts, as they have in all Churches.’

“That was the evidence given by Dr. Doyle, before the Committee of the House of Lords in England, on the 21st of March, 1825,—when it was necessary to make out a smooth case before the people of this Country. But the same individual was examined, only twenty-four days afterwards, on the 14th of April, before the Commissioners of Education, in the presence of other Bishops; and this is the evidence, which the Prime Minister of England has declared, that he and the whole Cabinet have diligently studied, before they introduced this measure,—so as to render it unnecessary for them to make any further inquiry. He is asked—‘Would you allow any of the peasantry of Ireland, who might persevere in reading the Bible in the Authorised Version, after having been prohibited by your Clergy, to be received to the sacraments?’ ‘Certainly I would not.’ ‘You would consider them, in effect, being guilty of contemptuous disobedience to your Church?’ ‘Certainly.’

“He had before sworn, *in England*, that some enthusiastic young men in his Church might perhaps have done it, but *before God he never heard of it!* But, *in Ireland*, he swears, *he would do it himself!* Such is the oath of a man instructed in the doctrines of the College of Maynooth, which the British Parliament is about to endow!

“Take another case—the case of a Bishop who, to get Emancipation and political power, had taken an oath, in conjunction with all the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland,—‘disclaiming, disavowing, and solemnly abjuring any intention to subvert the Church Establishment, as settled by law; and swearing that he would never exercise any privilege to which he might be entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant Religion.’ Yet here is an extract from his letter to the Bishop of Exeter on the subject: ‘Far, then, from shrinking from any avowal of hostility to a system fraught with such injustice, I frankly own, that the Establishment has been, and shall continue to be, the object of every legal and constitutional opposition in my power; however irreconcilable you may deem such a declaration with the obligation of our oath, I must protest against your competency to expound its meaning, as the guide for my theology.’ What is this but a declaration, that, when he was taking his oath, he despised his oath, he trampled upon his oath; but it was expedient to take it, in order to blind the people of England? Such is the influence of that

Maynooth doctrine on Oaths. And these individuals are now to be intrusted with the public money, to select young men, and bring them under the influence of the same education, with which they have been corrupted themselves.

“But my Lord Brougham proceeded further:

“‘There was no man in that House or out of it, who could surpass him in the belief he entertained of the errors of the Roman Catholic system, and of the evil tendency, politically speaking, of the Roman Catholic policy. He said nothing whatever about Articles of Faith; that House was not the fit place to discuss such sacred points; let those Articles of Faith—which only concerned the soul of man and his relation to the Supreme Being—be sacred from discussion in that place; he had his own opinion on those subjects, but it was needless to enter on them on that occasion. But he could speak of those doctrines, which had been engrafted on the Catholic faith by the wit of man,—by men crowned with the mitre and armed with the crosier, by popes and by bishops; as to those, he felt no hesitation in treating of them, because they did not approach the religious part of the question by a hundred leagues. He would not refer to them at all, but that they formed the subject of nine-tenths of the arguments that had been urged against the Bill.’

“I rejoice to see the bold and honest avowal of faithful attachment to Protestant principles with which the noble and learned Lord begins; and I have not the least doubt, that it is only want of information on this important subject, that could lead him to desire to endow such an iniquitous system, as that of the College of Maynooth.

“His Lordship says, that ‘the doctrines engrafted on the Catholic faith by Popes and Bishops, do not approach the religious part of the question by a hundred leagues.’ Why, they are inseparably identified with the Religion of the Church of Rome. I have with me here the Creed of the ancient Catholic Church, which we call the Nicene Creed, established at the Council of Nice in 324, recapitulated at the Council of Constantinople in 381, at the Council of Ephesus in 431, and at the Council of Chalcedon in 451; and proved to have remained unchanged in 1546; for, in that year, in the third Session of the Council of Trent, that Council recites it as the Creed of the Christian Church,—which is received by all who call themselves Christians over the world, and which is the true and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. So that there was no such thing as the creed of the Church of Rome, before 1546; but, all Christendom being overspread with error, Rome desiring to reform the Church, held her Council of Trent, and ‘engrafted’ (as the noble and learned lord has it,) twelve erroneous doctrines upon the ancient Catholic faith; while England, also desiring to reform the Church, cast off the iniquities that had crept over Christendom, and resolved to adhere only to that ancient faith, without addition;—which faith she still keeps whole and undefiled. Accordingly, when the Council of Trent was over, Pope Pius IV., on the 9th of December, 1564, modelled all these abominable errors into a modern Creed, consisting of twelve Articles, which he added to the ancient Christian creed; and instead of being ‘a hundred leagues’ asunder, they follow close upon the ancient Nicene Creed. The old Nicene Creed, and the twelve new errors, are incorporated by Pope Pius IV. into one Creed, which it calls the ‘faith, out of which none can be saved;’ and the last article of which is—‘I likewise profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and general Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also condemn, reject, and anathematise all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever, condemned, rejected and anathematised by the Church.’

"The Church of Rome thus adopts and takes as her own, *all* that the sacred canons and general Councils have declared; it is *all* sworn to by every priest, and every Professor in Maynooth; and yet the noble and learned Lord speaks of those corrupt doctrines as being 'a hundred leagues from the Religion taught at Maynooth'!

"His Lordship goes on:

"But even admitting all that was said about the doctrines taught at Maynooth—admitting that all those pernicious books were to be found there—still they only went to destroy the argument that was founded upon them; if those doctrines were now taught at Maynooth, would opposing that increase of the Grant prevent their being taught?"

"Opposing the increase of the Grant could not prevent their being taught; but the thing then moved for would prevent it—an honest, faithful inquiry, bringing them out in evidence before the face of the Nation. I say, that the lay Roman Catholics of Ireland themselves would not endure to have them taught in their College,—if they were brought out, as they ought to be, and diffused through the length and breadth of Ireland. And they ought to be printed and circulated through the Empire—that every Roman Catholic might know what are the real principles inculcated in his College; and that it is not from want of liberality, or generosity, or kindness, or affection, that the people of England are unwilling to endow it; but because that College teaches iniquities, which he himself could not desire to have disseminated. But, though voting against that Grant would not prevent these doctrines from being taught, giving that Grant increases the facility of their being taught. Giving that Grant gives them the sanction and authority of the British Parliament. Giving that Grant incorporates them with the Laws of England; and so the Law of England, the Parliament of England, the Crown of England, is dishonoured, by being made the patron, the protector, the endower of the iniquitous system, that is taught in the College of Maynooth.

"But the next sentence of the noble and learned Lord is one to which I earnestly call your attention:

"The Noble Earl opposite was not wrong in his facts as to the passages, which were to be found in the books used at Maynooth; but he took a wrong issue founded on those facts. It was quite a mistake, to suppose that the passages he had referred to, from the Statute books and the Decretals—from Menochius and Maldonatus,—from Bailly and from Collet,—were not to be found in the books used at Maynooth. Every one of those quotations of the noble Earl was right, chapter and verse; and all those bad doctrines were to be found in those books."

"Why, the testimony we have been adducing has been denounced as 'the bray of Exeter Hall;' but here is 'the bray of Exeter Hall' echoed by the loud, sonorous voice of the noble and learned Lord in his place in Parliament. Lord Brougham declares, (and who will dare to doubt Lord Brougham's word?) that every document adduced upon this platform 'is to be found in the Class-books and Standards of Maynooth.' From my heart I thank the noble and learned Lord for his honest admission; he would not admit such facts, if he did not know them to be true. But his Lordship draws a wrong conclusion, as many a logician has done, from the premises he has admitted. He proceeds:

"But the question did not depend on what was to be found in those books; and therefore it was not necessary for him to enter into their contents. No one could doubt, that those doctrines concerning heretics, and the obligation of oaths,



were to be found in St. Thomas Aquinas, and Maldonatus, and even in St. Augustin, one of the fathers of the Church.'

"Noble, admirable admission! We have no more necessity to go into the evidence of these things at Exeter Hall; it is a fact admitted, acknowledged, authenticated by Lord Brougham, that the Class-books and Standards of Maynooth contain all the abominable doctrines we have ascribed to them. But mark the error of his conclusion.

"But to show that all those doctrines formed part of the books at Maynooth, had no bearing on the question; the question was, what was really taught at Maynooth.'

"The noble and learned Lord here appears to have fallen into the same marvellous mistake with Mr. Wyse,—that the students at Maynooth really do not learn the principles which are to be found in their books! The *onus probandi* certainly lies upon *him*; and *he* ought to show *what it is they do learn*.

"And what was the fact? Why, that these bad doctrines did not occupy one page to one hundred of the books used at Maynooth.'

"This is an argument, which I must say rather surprises me; because, if bad principles are really taught in any book in one, two, three, or four pages, and if they are not mitigated, or denied, or condemned in any other part of the book, it stands to common sense that they, and none other, must be the genuine principles of that book. But I challenge all the Professors of Maynooth to show that these doctrines are contradicted or mitigated in any other part of their volumes. It is impossible for them to bring any Standard of any Papal Collège in Europe, in Dogmatic or Moral Theology, in which these principles do not constitute the only doctrines taught upon the subject."

Mr. M'Ghee then clearly showed that the statement of Lord Brougham was not consistent with fact. He proceeded:

"But the noble and learned Lord especially mentioned documents quoted in Parliament, namely, the Commentaries on the Scriptures by Menochius and Maldonatus. Does he mean to say, that these—the Commentary of Menochius, which the student is obliged to buy, and which refers him to Maldonatus—are not taught, as the principles of the Scriptures, to the students of Maynooth? In the second Article of the Creed, every priest swears—'I admit the Holy Scriptures according to that sense, which our holy mother, the Church, has held, and does hold; to whom it belongs to judge of the sense and interpretation of Scripture; nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.' The Professor swears *that*; and the interpretation which he gives to the students of Maynooth, is that of Menochius and Maldonatus. If this be not proof, that these doctrines are taught in Maynooth, I know not where proof is to be found.

"I shall not trespass longer on your time by the citation of other documents. But, if these books are not taught in the College of Maynooth, why is it, that, when the priests leave the College, these same principles are inculcated in those books which they are obliged to have, to teach them to guide the consciences of the people? Why, after the year 1829, when Protestant England opened her Constitution to the Church of Rome, what was the first act of the Bishops of the Church of Rome in Ireland? *The Theology of Dens was republished under their authority*, for the instruction of the priests, in guiding the people: and to that Theology was added a code of Canon Law,—in which all the worst decretals of the Church of Rome, the

decretals for the condemnation of heretics, the decretals for the subversion of thrones, the decretals for the restitution of property, and in fact all the Bulls of the Popes,—the existence of which those Bishops had denied upon their oath, in order to obtain admission to political power,—were published under their authority in Ireland; so that Ireland at this moment is not under the Laws of England, but under the Laws of Rome. And the system of these conferences,—this system of instruction for the people and the priests, the system of Canon Law set up by the Bishops of Ireland—*this it is, which it is now proposed to incorporate with the Laws of England, and to endow by the authority of the British Parliament!*

“I do not want, for one, to deprive the Roman Catholics of any advantage which can justly be afforded them. If I had the privilege or the power of dealing with Ireland, it would not be a paltry sum of a few thousands a year I should give to them; I would give to the Roman Catholics of Ireland hundreds of thousands a year, to improve their condition, and to make them happy. *But I would not give a farthing to enslave them; I would not give a farthing to those, who shut out the light of God's eternal Truth from the souls of my countrymen.* I could not be guilty of the awful iniquity of teaching men, at the public expense, to instruct the people in a novel Creed, that never was heard of till the year 1564. I could not be guilty of the crime of training men in a system of perjury—a system of anti-social, intolerant, persecuting iniquity. I could not dare, as the servant of my Sovereign, to support a system that aims at the subversion of that Sovereign's Throne—confessedly and avowedly aims at it, in the Standards and documents taught in this College of Maynooth. And therefore I cordially rejoice in the convention that I see before me, prepared to approach the Throne of our gracious Sovereign, and to address her on this important subject. We are to remember, indeed, that, in our Constitution, the Ministers of the Crown are those who must be responsible; and who alone can be accountable,—as they really are the agents of the political acts of the Sovereign; and therefore we cannot justly deceive ourselves with the idea, that those who have forced this Bill through Parliament, will advise our most gracious Sovereign to answer the prayer of this Petition; but, although we may not expect that, I trust it will only fill the hearts of her faithful, loyal Protestant subjects with greater devotion to the Throne; and lead them, through the length and breadth of the Empire, to rally round that Throne, and to exercise their privilege, when the time shall be given them, to return men who also will rally round that Throne, and advise her to maintain inviolate the Protestant Constitution of England. And I do trust, and I do believe, that if this Bill shall pass the British Parliament, the day is not far distant, when that Parliament shall inquire into the principles taught in the College of Maynooth, and see, that it is its indispensable duty, and necessary to the existence of the laws and liberties of England,—not only to reform that College, but to prevent by Law such doctrines being taught in any part of her Majesty's dominions. For it is the duty of Parliament, to protect the Civil and Religious Liberties of the subject; it is the duty of Parliament, to prevent crime, and, if possible, to prevent a public school of sedition, for teaching (for instance) the principles of Ribandism; and therefore Parliament is called upon to prevent, instead of endowing, a system which in my soul I believe to be the nurse and foundation of all the political and civil crimes of Ireland. It is wholly impossible, that a poor population, who believe their immortal souls depend upon the absolving power of their priests, and whose consciences are to be guided by those priests, should be instructed in such a system as this, and be free from the crimes that, I am sorry to say, deface and degrade my Country.

"I shall conclude by quoting, what the noble and learned Lord has said, in endeavouring to vindicate the doctrines of Maynooth from the charge of being persecuting; or rather, the Professors of Maynooth, for he admits the fact as to the doctrines.

"It was not right to suppose that the Roman Catholic Church was the only one that had fallen into these grievous errors, or that intolerance was confined to that Church. It was a melancholy consideration, but one to which all Ecclesiastical History bore witness, that, in proportion as any Church was armed with power—not spiritual, but secular power—so there had been in Churches so situated a tendency to persecute other sects."

"And then he says, if Thomas Aquinas had been a persecutor, 'who, he should like to know, was one John Calvin?'"

"The Noble and Learned Lord has then given a story, of which I can only say, that I have not seen a similar one, of the death of Servetus; and he has asserted, that in Calvin's writings the doctrines of persecution are vindicated. It may be so. I have not seen them in any of Calvin's writings that I have read; but I do not presume to contradict the Noble and Learned Lord. But this I will say; that I do not wonder that Calvin did hold doctrines of persecution. Why did he hold them? *He was educated in a college like the College of Maynooth. And so were all our Reformers*; and the only wonder is, that the light of God's Truth so speedily emancipated their minds from those abominable doctrines, and brought them to understand that the kingdom of God is not to be maintained by crimes; that it consists in 'righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.'

"The Noble and Learned Lord has ventured to quote, as an example of persecuting doctrines, the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed: 'this is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.' But he has fallen into a very great and fundamental error, when he attempts to identify *the denunciation of those who hold not God's Truth*, by the ministers of that Truth, *with the persecuting doctrines of Rome*. What is the business of a Minister of God's Truth—a Minister of the everlasting Gospel? What is his commission, and what is his office? 'Son of man, I have set thee a watchman unto the house of Israel; therefore thou shalt hear the word at My mouth, and give them warning from Me. When I say unto the wicked, O wicked man, thou shalt surely die; if thou dost not speak to warn the wicked from his way, that wicked man shall die in his iniquity; but his blood will I require at thine hand.' What is the duty of every Christian Minister, to whatever Denomination he may belong? To declare God's righteous judgments against those who deny *the Truth of God*. If God's blessed commission to us is, to 'preach the Gospel to every creature;' when he tells us—'he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved,' He addeth—'he that believeth not, shall be damned:' and, if we proclaim the great salvation that is in our blessed Lord and Master, we *must* proclaim the awful fruit of rejecting 'the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus.' But here is the difference. *We* denounce falsehood in doctrine, *we* denounce guilt in practice; *but how do we denounce it? We turn men to the Word of God; we call on them to search the Word of God*. We do not pronounce it on our own authority; we do not dare to say for the Established Church, that she has the right of pronouncing condemnation on any man; we do not presume to judge any man by the authority of the Church, but *we testify God's Truth*: and we call on every man to judge by that Truth, and to judge for his own soul, as he shall stand before the living God. But the Church of Rome denounces a man, *not because he rejects God's Truth, but because he does not submit to her authority*. Here is one of the

Class-books of Maynooth, written for the College; in which the author states, that if any man, separated from the Church of Rome, and rejecting her authority, were not only to believe in Christ, but so to believe in Christ that he would become a martyr for Christ's sake, all that it could do for him (*since he did not submit to the Church*) would be, that he should be more tolerably punished in hell. *That is the doctrine of Rome upon the subject*; and therein is the difference between the liberty and freedom and righteousness of Protestantism in referring men to God's Word, and the guilt and iniquity and tyranny of the Church of Rome, which claims authority over every baptized man, and that he is to be punished, condemned, and executed, *if he dares to resist HER authority*. The Noble and Learned Lord made a lamentable mistake, when he attempted to identify the principles of the Church of England, with the dark and desolating tyranny of the Church of Rome.

"And now I can only add, that I rejoice at last to read, that the Noble and Learned Lord professes Protestant principles. I rejoice to see that he testifies his gratitude to 'the glorious, pious, and immortal memory of William the Third.' I only mourn to think on the lamentable inconsistency, (arising, as I think I have proved, from ignorance of the facts,) of a man praising 'the glorious, pious, and immortal memory of William the Third, who rescued us from Popery and slavery,' and yet using his great talents to plead, and his high position as a legislator to endow, that damnable system of Papal slavery."

On the evening of the same day on which this Meeting was held, the Second Reading of the Bill was carried in the House of Lords—as has been already stated, by a Majority of 237 to 73;—a lamentable proof of the want of Protestant principle among the Nobles of this professedly Protestant land. And most humiliating of all it was, to find the names of one Archbishop, and five Bishops of the "Reformed Protestant Church established by Law," among those who voted for the Endowment of Maynooth. On this subject, however, the Record of Monday, June 9th, made the following remarks :

"We are, on the whole, rather relieved and almost gratified, by the conduct of the Episcopal Bench of Wednesday last. Not that, theoretically, it can be any other than a matter of grief and shame, to see five or six Prelates of a Protestant Church, speaking and voting in favour of the public endowment of a Popish seminary. But, taking a practical view, and remembering *who* the Bishops are, and *how* they came to be there, we are better satisfied than we expected to be, to find only *six* votes in favour of the Maynooth Bill, and *seventeen* against it.

"Our previous anticipation was, that eight or nine might be induced to support the Measure, and hardly more than twelve to oppose it. For we saw on their Lordships' Bench as many as *eight* Prelates who had been placed there by the Melbourne Cabinet, as men of 'Liberal' principles; and *three* others who had been elevated to the same rank by Sir Robert Peel, and who might naturally be expected to feel a kind of reluctance to oppose a Minister who has so highly distinguished them. On the other side, too, we observed several very aged Prelates, who were likely to decline interfering in a question concerning which even Churchmen were divided; and it seemed also necessary to allow something for the mere possibility of ambitious yearnings in one or two of their Lordships' breasts, considering the great age of the two Primates. But the Division has proved the real state of the case to be considerably better than we had imagined.

"The votes, present and by proxy, were as follows:—

FOR.	AGAINST.
Abp. Dublin	Abp. Canterbury
Bp. Durham	York
Norwich	Bp. London
Worcester	Winchester
St. David's	Chester
Chichester	Exeter
	Lichfield
	Ripon
	Oxford
	St. Asaph
	Lincoln
	Bangor
	Carlisle
	Llandaff
	Gloucester
	Peterborough
	Cashel

"Now here it is fair to remark, that from Doctors Stanley and Maltby, who subscribed to Socinian sermons and voted for the Socinian Endowment Bill of last Session, nothing better could be expected; nor from Archbishop Whately, or Dr. Thirlwall, both of whose writings are tinged with Neologianism and worldly philosophy. The Bishop of Worcester is a respectable and worthy man, but probably somewhat influenced by his brother, Lord Cottenham, a most zealous 'Liberal.' Dr. Gilbert is the last and the only positive deserter; and him we regard as somewhat biased by gratitude to Sir Robert Peel, and thus inclined to accept the delusive pleas of the *Standard* and *Morning Herald*.

"On the other side, however, it is quite certain, that we have all the weight and character of the Episcopal Bench. Both of the Archbishops, coming out of that retirement which becomes men in the last days of their earthly existence; the energy of the Bishops of London, Exeter, Winchester, and Chester,—four very different men, but all unquestionably eminent, and all agreeing on this question; the learning and experience of the Bishops of Lincoln, Llandaff, and Gloucester,—all ranged on one side, and balanced by next to nothing on the other.

"It is gratifying, too, to observe in opposition to the Government on a question of vast weight and importance, *every man whose name has ever been mentioned as in probable succession to the Primacy*. It would be romantic to suppose, that the thought never crosses the minds of the more eminent on their Lordships' Bench; but it is quite a relief to observe, how it appears to have been dismissed with a becoming disregard, when a question of great Religious importance came before them for decision.

"One gratifying effect of Sir Robert Peel's first speech on the subject was, the change it effected on the mind of the Bishop of Ripon. Previous to the delivery of that speech, as we are informed, his Lordship was inclined to favour the Grant. The new views it presented to him effected, happily, a decided and permanent change on his mind."

That the fact of there being *only* six Prelates of a Protestant Church who voted for Maynooth, should be matter of congratulation and com-

fort, shows us to be, indeed, in a painful condition. But there were only *seventeen* who recorded their votes against it. Where were the other *seven*, who gave no vote at all ? who, on such a momentous question—a question between Christ and Antichrist—were content to be silent and neutral ?

The Third Reading in the House of Lords took place on Monday, June 16th. The Discussion was not very long. The Bishop of Llandaff, the Duke of Newcastle, the Earl of Wicklow, the Marquis of Breadalbane, and the Earl of Clancarty strongly opposed the Bill.

Lord Campbell, the Earl of Ellenborough, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Stanley, the Duke of Wellington, the Earl of Chichester, the Earl of Rosse, and the Marquis of Lansdowne spoke in its favour.

Their Lordships then divided,—when there appeared :

Content—Present . . . . .	104
Proxies . . . . .	77
	<hr/>
	181
Not Content—Present . . . . .	34
Proxies . . . . .	16
	<hr/>
	50
Majority for the Third Reading .	131

On the question, that the Bill do pass, the Earl of Winchilsea moved, as an Amendment, that the operation of the Bill be limited to three years: which was negatived without a Division, and the Bill passed.

The following Protest against the Third Reading was drawn up, and entered upon the records of the House of Lords.

“ Dissentient—

“ 1. Because I hold it to be contradictory to the first principles of the Reformation to provide for the Establishment of an order of men, to be educated for the express purpose of resisting and defeating that Reformation—men whose office and main duty it will be, to disseminate and to perpetuate those very corruptions of the Christian faith which the Church of England has solemnly abjured, and some of which the whole Legislature of England has declared to be superstitious and idolatrous.

“ 2. Because the most unbounded toleration of Religious error does not require us to provide for the maintenance and the growth of that error ; but rather imposes upon us a strong obligation to prevent, by all just and peaceful means, its increase, and to discourage its continuance.

“ 3. Because this Measure has a tendency to raise in the public mind a belief that Religious Truth is a matter of indifference to the State ; and, by consequence, to subvert that principle of Succession to the Throne, which is the title of the pre-

sent Dynasty, and which forms an integral and essential part of the Constitution of this kingdom.

"E. LLANDAFF.

"C. WINTON.

"CLANCARTY.

"C. J. LONDON.

"J. B. CHESTER.

"R. CASHEL, &c.

"WINCHILSEA and NOTTINGHAM.

"CADOGAN."

To which, doubtless, Protestants, in every part of the Country, would have been glad to have seen more signatures affixed.\*

---

\* It should, however, be recorded, also, that the following protest against the Second Reading was made by Lords Farnham and Kenyon :—

"PROTEST AGAINST THE SECOND READING OF THE MAYNOOTH BILL.

"Dissentient—1. Because I have always viewed the Establishment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth as a Measure bad in principle, and not productive of any of those advantages which (as an experiment and a mere measure of political expediency) might possibly have, on those grounds, justified its original adoption.

"2. Because I have always entertained the strongest conviction, that the Annual Grant to the College of Maynooth was a measure to which, as a Protestant, I could not assent; as educating, for the spiritual instruction of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland, an inferior class of persons, taken, in most instances, from the lower orders of the people; and therefore not likely to use, for the general advantage of the Country, the immense power which they must possess, as the spiritual guides of a naturally intelligent, sensitive, and easily excited people.

"3. Because my sentiments as to the character of the education adopted in the College of Maynooth have been fully corroborated by the Evidence taken before the Commissioners of Irish Education in their Eighth Report; and the admissions of the Professors of that Institution prove, to my complete satisfaction, that the authorised Class-books of Maynooth (which every student is obliged to purchase,) and the Standards to which they are referred, contain doctrines, the inoculation of which upon the youth, who are to be the spiritual guides and directors of the great body of the Irish people, must be fraught with the greatest danger to the peace and well-being of the united Empire.

"4. Because, objecting so strongly to the Annual Grant to the College of Maynooth, these objections are infinitely increased, when it is proposed to give to that institution a permanent Endowment, unaccompanied by any check or control on the part of the Legislature.

"5. Because, it is my firm conviction, that the effect of the present measure for the permanent Endowment of Maynooth, will be, to increase the number of the Roman Catholic priesthood, without improving the quality of that body.

"Because, considering this Measure to be bad in itself, and dangerous in its consequences, I cannot but view it as the precursor of other Measures, which, in the march of events, it must carry with it—involving (perhaps, at no distant period) the destruction of our Protestant Established Church.

"FARNHAM.

"KENYON."

The only Constitutional effort which now remained was, the presentation of Addresses to the Queen. For this purpose the Earl of Winchilsea, insisting on his privilege as a Peer of the Realm, obtained an interview with her Majesty; on which occasion he presented to her Majesty four hundred and seventy addresses, praying our Gracious Sovereign to dissolve the present Parliament before she gave her Royal Assent to a Measure, to which her Protestant subjects, of all Denominations, were so stedfastly and conscientiously opposed.

A number of other Addresses, to the same effect, were transmitted by the Marquis of Breadalbane, the Earl of Effingham, and others, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, to be laid before Her Majesty.

The whole number of these Addresses, the Committee had no means of ascertaining.

It was not, however, to be expected, that those Ministers who had pushed the Measure through both Houses of Parliament, in spite of so many Petitions from all parts of the Country, would recommend their Royal Mistress to take such an extraordinary step. It was right, that Protestants should use every Constitutional method of opposing the Measure, in order to clear their own consciences. The result was, of course, anticipated by all.

On Monday, June 30th, Her Majesty's Royal Assent to the Bill for the Endowment of Maynooth—along with about eighty other Bills—was announced in the House of Lords.

Thus ended, then, this important struggle, for the present. It remains only to offer a few remarks.

And first, in reference to the Petitions against the Bill. The following statement was drawn up by a Member of the Anti-Maynooth Committee, for insertion in one of the principal Newspapers—but it does not appear that it ever was inserted. It may not *here* be out of place,—though the writer alone is responsible for the sentiments it contains.

#### “PETITIONS AGAINST THE ENDOWMENT OF MAYNOOTH.

“Sir,—The Anti-Maynooth contest having now come to a close, it may not be uninteresting to your readers in general—certainly not to those who all along have taken an interest in the question—to consider a few **FACTS**. I will therefore mention some, connected with the expression of the sentiments of the people by means of Petitions, which have come before me, as a regular member of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, and which I have carefully noted down.

“I was curious to compare the recent struggle with another, in which I felt a deep interest, and which took place sixteen years ago.

“In a record of the proceedings connected with the Roman Catholic Relief Bill in 1829, which I happen to have preserved, I find it stated, that there were presented—

<i>Against</i> that measure :		<i>For</i> it :
To the House of Commons,	2013 Petitions.	955
To the House of Lords,	2521	1014



"The majority, therefore, in the latter case, was 1507 *against* the measure: the proportion was nearly  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 1.

"Great complaints were *then* made, that the measure was passed with *unconstitutional and indecent haste*; so that those who were opposed to it had not time to sign and send in their Petitions.

"On the recent occasion, it appears from a Parliamentary Document, from which I copy, that the Petitions have been as follows:—

"Presented to the House of Commons between February 4th and May 30th, 1845,

"*Against* the Maynooth Bill:

*For* it:

10,204 Petitions,

90

(signed by 1,284,296 persons;)

(signed by 17,482.)

"I know that exceptions are taken against the signatures in some cases. The same person may have signed two or three Petitions, in some instances. On the other hand, some of those Petitions have been signed by one person (the Chairman) on behalf of a numerous and respectable Meeting; or by one official person, on behalf of a corporate body. Again and again I have been assured, that, had time permitted, the number of signatures would have been (in many cases) doubled, trebled, or even quadrupled.

"These questions, however, I only notice by the way. I do not enter into them. One thing is obvious—that the number of Petitions *against* the Maynooth Bill, presented to *the House of Commons* this year, *far* outnumbers all those which were presented to *both Houses*, *for* and *against* the measure of 1829. And, looking at the proportion between those *against* and those *for*, it is easy to make the calculation; we find that the number of *Petitions against* the Bill is 113 times as great as the number *for* it; and the number of *signatures against* it is 73 times greater than the number *for* it.

"Is it said, that all those Petitions *against* the Bill were got up by a Committee in London? It may be answered, all the influence of Government, who were glad enough to have Petitions *for* it, could only produce 90! And a few obscure individuals could get up 10,204 *against* it! How was this? There can be but one answer. Because the feeling of the people was already decidedly *against* the Bill; and the feeblest voice was therefore sufficient to call forth the expression of that feeling from more than a million tongues.

"One word more. From my connexion with the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, I can testify to the fact, that the haste with which this measure has been carried through Parliament, has prevented, evaded, and paralysed a great deal of opposition, which would have been organised and manifested, had more time been allowed. Sir Robert Peel has certainly shown the craft of a practised politician, in carrying this measure by surprise and precipitation: he has manifested the wisdom of the serpent. But the question must arise—it *must* be considered—it *will* be considered by the intelligent inhabitants and citizens of this country,—Is this really the way to legislate for and govern a great Nation? Is this the way to legislate for a free people? Sir Robert Peel has dealt with the Nation *as if it were an enemy*. He has used all the stratagems of war *against the people whom he was called to govern*. Is this CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT? Or is it the conduct of the most unconstitutional Despot that ever was Prime Minister of England?

"I must beg leave to add, that the conduct of Lord John Russell and the Whigs has been equally unconstitutional; and far more inconsistent with their high professions of regard to the Rights of the People. Lord John Russell, the Whigs, and the Radicals,—the men who have made the greatest noise about the Rights and Liberties

of the People, all their lives long,—have treated the Petitions of the People with supreme contempt; and they have done all that in them lay, to deprive the People of the constitutional Right of Petitioning. And all this in a *Reformed House of Commons*,—which was indeed to represent the mind and wishes of the people!

“I will make no further remark. I wish to commend these facts to the consideration of plain, old-fashioned Englishmen, who value the Principles of the British Constitution; and remain, Yours, &c.”

The statement in the above letter, respecting the Petitions presented to the House of Commons, is taken from a regular Parliamentary Document, which is accessible to the Public, and may be obtained at the Office for the sale of Parliamentary Papers, in Great Turnstile, Lincoln's Inn Fields; but the Editor has not been able to obtain any authentic statement of the Petitions presented to the House of Lords—which, there is reason to suppose, must have been equally numerous,—if not much more so. On sending to the House of Lords the following questions: Is there any Report *printed*, of the Petitions presented to the House of Lords? Is there any authentic statement *printed*, of the two Divisions on the Maynooth Endowment Bill? he received a written answer to both of them in the negative. Nor has he been more successful in regard to the number of Addresses to the Queen, praying for a Dissolution of Parliament. The number sent through the hands of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee was 682, with 173,763 signatures; but it is certain that vastly greater numbers were forwarded by other means.

But from the contemplation of the *past* efforts of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, it is now desirable, in bringing this Historical Sketch to a conclusion, to give a glance at the *future*.

The work of that Committee cannot be considered as completed. The Conference, and the Public Meeting, which were convened, and in which such multitudes of Protestants were assembled, have left important work upon its hands. This will appear from an attentive perusal of the Resolutions;—especially those which were passed at Exeter Hall, on Thursday evening, May 1st. Nor should it be forgotten, that every one who held up his hand in favour of those Resolutions, and every one who, in any manner, approved and adopted them, must be considered as having incurred thereby a solemn responsibility to assist, according to his power, in carrying them out; and (to insist on only one particular) to aid in providing the Committee with the means of carrying on efficiently those measures which have been committed to its charge. It must be considered as a matter of humiliation,—it has been publicly urged as a reproach against them,—that British Protestants have not hitherto come forward, with that liberality which became them, to redeem the pledges which they have publicly given, and to enable the

Committee to meet all the liabilities, which (in reliance upon the generosity of British Protestants) they took upon themselves. This is not as it should be. When there is any object to be attained, in which any *section* of the Protestant Church feels a lively and *peculiar* interest, the funds are immediately forthcoming. The Church of England can find funds for Church objects : Wesleyans for those in which that Body is more especially concerned : and the various classes of Dissenters for various Dissenting objects. *But who will make sacrifices and exertions in the Cause of our common Protestantism?* Do we here find the lamentable proof of the old saying, that *what is every man's business, is no one's?* Is that which deeply concerns *all*, attended to by *none*? On reviewing the whole series of exertions which have been made, and the history of this struggle from the first,—it must be confessed, that the Committee *never* were supplied with adequate funds. Their exertions were always cramped and limited for want of means. The circumstances called for far greater exertions, and more extensive operations : but they were not supplied with the means of making them, or carrying them on, upon a scale commensurate with the greatness of the object, and the difficulties they had to encounter. Limited by considerations of prudence and justice, as their efforts were, they have not *yet* been enabled to answer every demand upon them.

Yet two immensely important objects are still before them. One has reference to *the approaching Elections*, the other to *Protestant Union*. And the Committee have pledged themselves to persevering effort by the following Resolution,—the last which it is necessary to transcribe from the records of their Proceedings.

“ June 19th, 1845.

“ Resolved—That, notwithstanding the want of success which has attended their efforts to prevent the Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth, the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee feel, that duty to God and to their Country demands, that they should not cease to exert themselves to the utmost of their energies, in such further endeavours to resist the progress of Popery as circumstances may permit.”

With regard to *the next Elections*. The whole history of the late struggle serves to show, most painfully, *the want of Protestant Principle in the House of Commons*. That House, in its utter contempt of Protestantism and true Religion, has acted most unconstitutionally. It has despised and trampled upon such a multitude of Petitions—such a manifestation of the feeling of the Constituencies of the Empire—as never had been presented before. Can *nothing* be done to remedy this great and crying evil? Can British Protestants do *nothing* to return *stanch, determined, conscientious Protestants* to Parliament? If they

cannot do *great things*, could they not, by combined exertions, return some *twenty* sound Protestant Members to Parliament? If it were only *ten*, *this* would be something gained. And is it unreasonable to expect that this should be done?

But then it must be by COMBINED EXERTIONS; and SOUND PROTESTANTISM must be *the* qualification sought and insisted on.

If the *Churchman* be not disposed to say, that *sound Protestantism* is *far* more important than *Churchmanship*; and the *Dissenter* be not ready to say, that *sound Protestantism* is *far* more important than *Voluntaryism*;—nothing effectual, it must be feared, *can* (under present circumstances) be done. If Churchman and Tory should say, We must have a Tory and a High-Churchman, *though he be a Papist*, or *more than half a Papist*: and if Dissenters and Liberals should say, We must have a Liberal and a Voluntary, *though he be an Infidel*;—what must the end of those things be, but the increase and prevalence, more and more, of *Popery* and *Infidelity*,—uniting (like Herod and Pilate) in strong and irresistible opposition to Evangelical Truth, and the Cause of Protestantism? And what tongue or pen can express the sin of those, who thus consent to sacrifice *Protestant and Evangelical Truth*, to such carnal and political considerations? If we do not value *Scriptural Truth*, and *the great Protestant Principles* in which all real Protestants are agreed,—*far* beyond all these matters of Political and Ecclesiastical difference,—*can we be said to value them at all?* He who once begins to exalt things Ecclesiastical above things Spiritual, is already very little better than a Papist, or an Infidel, at heart.

What then is wanted is *real Protestant Union*. And there can be no Protestant Union, unless Protestants will consent, in a measure, and for a season, to forget those things in which they differ, in order that they may cordially unite in maintaining, and contending for, those GREAT ESSENTIAL, GLORIOUS TRUTHS in which they are agreed.

The Editor begs leave to say this, as one who (for his own part) is ready to contend for *every particle of Divine Truth, in its place and season*: and he has proved this already by his writings. But “to everything there is a season, and a time for every purpose under the heaven:—a time of war, and a time of peace.”\* And,—as this is “a time of war” *against the common enemy*,—it ought to be “a time of peace” *among ourselves*.

Most gladly, then, does he conclude this labour to which he has been called, by introducing to his Readers, the proposal for a Conference on the subject of PROTESTANT UNION, to which the following letters refer. It is a subject which has engaged his earnest attention, and his prayers,

---

\* Eccl. iii. 1, 8.

for many years. What the *immediate result* of this effort may be, he cannot pretend to say. No doubt the difficulties are immense: and the first point gained may be, *the clearer discovery of the nature and extent of those difficulties*. But that, *ultimately*, a blessing will follow every sincere and earnest endeavour to promote real and cordial Union among all Protestant and Evangelical Christians,—with the Bible in his hand, he cannot, and dare not doubt.

He feels, that he cannot do better than end his work, with a prayer which he finds in the Liturgy of that Church to which he esteems it a privilege to belong. He could easily show, at great length, that the spirit of this prayer pervades all the formularies of that Church, to an extent of which, he believes, but few are sufficiently aware; and which *some*, who profess to be very high and zealous Churchmen, most strangely and entirely forget. But this is not the time or place to enlarge upon that point. It is time to conclude with prayer:

“O God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, our only Saviour, the Prince of Peace; Give us grace seriously to lay to heart the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions. Take away all hatred and prejudice, and whatsoever else may hinder us from godly Union and Concord: that, as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one Hope of our Calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of Truth and Peace, of Faith and Charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord.—Amen.”

“If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema Maran-atha.”—1 Cor. xvi. 22.

“Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity. Amen.”—Eph. vi. 24.

“We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the Brethren.”—1 John iii. 14.

“ TO THE EVANGELICAL CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, WALES,  
AND IRELAND.

*“ Glasgow, 5th August, 1845.*

“ Dear Brethren,

“ You are aware of the Proposal which has emanated from various quarters, that a great Meeting of Evangelical Christians, belonging to different Churches and Countries, should be shortly convened in London, to associate and concentrate the strength of an enlightened Protestantism against the encroachments of Popery and Puseyism, and to promote the interests of a Scriptural Christianity. To us it appears, that a Preliminary Meeting, comprising Delegates from the various Denominations in Great Britain and Ireland, might with advantage, be held this Summer in some town of England. This subordinate measure has been submitted to various sections of Scottish Christians, and has obtained their cordial approbation; and most of the Subscribers to this Letter have been appointed to use their best endeavours for carrying it into execution. We earnestly and respectfully invite you to join us in this movement. On your co-operation its success depends; for, if limited to Scotland, it would be diminutive and ineffectual.

“ As to the objects of the Preliminary Meeting, we think it better not to speak with precision. The Delegates will shape their own course; and we abstain from any remarks or suggestions which might appear to invade the freedom of their deliberations. To any, however, who might object to the want of a defined aim, we would reply, in general, that there is, in our opinion, no want of work for the combined energies of Evangelical Christians. The very fact of meeting together would be a feast of charity to themselves, and would present an exemplification of brotherhood highly honouring to their religious profession. By this would all men know that they were Christ's disciples, because they loved one another.

“ When assembled, they might engage together in devotional exercises,—hear stirring appeals as to their individual and collective duties—indicate the basis of the greater Meeting to be called at their instance—and organise, or even set on foot, a series of measures, whether by Books, Tracts, Lectureships, or otherwise, for diffusing through all European countries a Scriptural knowledge of the salvation of Christ, and exploding the sceptical and superstitious systems so lamentably prevalent, by which the doctrines of the Cross are expressly denied, or buried under a heap of inventions and delusions.

“ We sincerely hope that you will give the subject your favourable consideration. It is easy to anticipate objections; but the end in view is too great and good to be abandoned on slight grounds.

“ We suggest the 1st of October as the day of meeting, and Liverpool as the place. It may be presumed that the important business to be transacted, will occupy not less than three days.

“ We are, dear Brethren,

“ Yours cordially.

FREE CHURCH.

Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D.  
P. M'Farlan, D.D.  
Robt. S. Candlish, D.D.  
W. Cunningham, D.D.  
Robt. Buchanan, D.D.

W. Mackay, LL.D.  
John Smyth, D.D.  
Thomas Guthrie  
James Begg  
W. M. Hetherington, LL.D.  
Adam Cairns

David Carmint  
 Breadalbane  
 D. Brewster, LL.D.  
 R. J. Brown, Professor of Greek,  
 Marischal College, Aberdeen  
 Alex. Campbell, Monzie  
 Andrew Bonar  
 Graham Speirs  
 William Brown  
 N. Stevenson  
 James Bridges

## UNITED SECESSION CHURCH.

John Brown, D.D.  
 H. Heugh, D.D.  
 James Harper, D.D.  
 David King, LL.D.  
 John Henderson  
 David Anderson  
 Ja. Peddee  
 Jo. Young  
 John Eadie, LL.D.  
 John Robson, D.D.  
 James Mitchell

## RELIEF CHURCH.

William Lindsay, D.D.  
 J. S. Taylor  
 William Brodie  
 Hugh Macfarlane

## REFORMED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

And. Symington, D.D.  
 William Symington, D.D.  
 A. M. Rogerson  
 John Macleod  
 Jas. M'Gill  
 Wm. Anderson  
 James Reid

## ORIGINAL SECESSION CHURCH.

Thomas M'Crie  
 Robt. J. Watt  
 William White

## CONGREGATIONALISTS.

Ralph Wardlaw, D.D.  
 Alex. W. Knowles  
 C. H. Bateman  
 William P. Paton  
 John Small

## BAPTIST CHURCH.

Alex. Macleod  
 James Paterson  
 William Innes  
 Robert Kettle

"P.S. It is intended that the Conference be held in the Assembly Rooms, Great George-street, beginning on Wednesday, the 1st October, at twelve o'clock."

"Exeter Hall, London, Sept. 5th, 1845.

"Dear Sir,

"The Central Anti-Maynooth Committee have requested me to thank you for the communication which you transmitted to me on the 27th August, signed by many highly-honoured brethren in Scotland, inviting us to depute some of our number to attend a Protestant Conference for the Three Kingdoms to be held at Liverpool in October, preparatory to a larger Evangelical assembly from all parts of Christendom, to be held in London, if the Lord permit, in 1846.

"I have already informed you how cordially the Committee accept the invitation. They have resolved to depute not less than twelve persons to attend the Conference on their behalf. The names of the clergymen, ministers, and others, who will constitute the Deputation, shall be transmitted to you with as little delay as possible.

"I have already conveyed to you a suggestion for extending the invitation to all classes of Christians holding the Head in Scotland; and, in the same spirit, I am confident that you will allow me to refer to one phrase in the circular. I allude to

the mention of 'the encroachments of Popery and *Puseyism*.' There is not one member of our Committee who is not opposed to every form of anti-evangelical error; but, while hoping that a movement against Popery will tend to open the eyes of the public to the evils of analogous systems, we feel that against Popery alone the present movement of Evangelical Christians should be directed. The Conference will include many members of the Established Church of England; and it will strike you at once, that it would not be becoming in them to make a specific and systematic assault on evils in their own communion, in conjunction with other Christians. We may all unite against the common apostacy; but in regard to errors in particular churches, the wisest and best course appears to be, that each community should resolve to contend with increased vigour against its own. You will not, I am certain, misunderstand the motive of these observations on the single passage in your circular which seemed to us to require some notice on our part, while we joyfully receive and comply with the invitation which it conveys.

"The Central Anti-Maynooth Committee consider, that the contemplated assembly of 1846, while it will neither exert nor claim the slightest authority over the European and American churches, may yet, under God, be the means of so combining the minds, and concentrating the energies of our brethren in various countries, as to lead to highly useful results to the interests of the Saviour's kingdom.

"Without in any way committing to any particular course those Christians who will take part in the ultimate, or in the preliminary Conference, I will briefly state the general objects to which we anticipate that their attention may be directed.

"I. The circumstances of the times demand from the true church of Jesus Christ an unanimous delivery of opinion as to the real character of the Papal system. That system is putting forth fresh vigour in various countries, and in none more than in our own; and it becomes an important question, whether the church has not failed in its duty of bearing an adequate and sufficiently combined testimony against the Romish apostacy. Would the Government and intelligent statesmen have lent themselves to the designs of the Papacy as they have done, if public opinion had been sufficiently enlightened on the subject? The language of the Reformers was unequivocal, and it is to be regretted that modern phraseology, and (it is feared) modern opinion should have considerably declined from the high standard of the sixteenth century. The Homily of the Church of England for Whitsunday says of the Romanist community, 'The state thereof is so far wide from the nature of a true church, that nothing can be more.' We anticipate, therefore, that the approaching assemblies will raise the question in the face of the Christian world, whether the Church of Rome is to be regarded, and if so in what sense, as a form of Christianity at all? The concentrated judgment of orthodox Christians upon this point, sustained by the authority of the Divine word, and promulgated through all countries where the Press in its various forms can convey it, cannot but conduce to the glory of God. It appears to this Committee, that it is high time that the compromise between truth and error, between Christ and Anti-Christ, should be brought to a termination, and that the question should no longer be held as doubtful, which of two antagonistic systems, claiming to be Christianity, is so in reality.

"II. But in order to a successful renewal of the protest against Rome of the sixteenth century, it appears to us expedient, not to say necessary, that the common principles of the true faith, and the general outline of the true church, should be exhibited by united Christians. These were regarded by Bishop Davenant, and the other advocates of peace and union among the reformed churches in the seventeenth century, as contained in the Creed, commonly called the Apostles', the Ten Com-



mandments, and the Lord's Prayer, as embodying the momentous facts, the essential duties, and the permanent subjects of prayer, on which all true Christians are agreed.

"The manifest union in faith and love of the evangelical churches, apart from uniformity of ritual and discipline, appears to be as indispensable to convict Rome of apostacy, as it is in harmony with the Saviour's prayer, and with the Divine purposes. There are principles so clearly laid down in the word of God, that they are essential to the sound Christianity, whether of an individual or of a church. Such are—the sufficiency of the inspired Scriptures as a rule of faith, and the duty of every man to examine them for himself; the blessed doctrine of the Trinity; the utterly depraved state of man by nature, and the necessity of vital conversion to God; the freeness of salvation; the justification of all believers by faith alone in the atonement of the Lord Jesus Christ; and their sanctification by the operation of the Holy Spirit. These are cardinal truths; and if these, developed by competent theologians, and expressed in simple language, could be upraised as the common standard of the churches, which are also agreed in the Divine institution and present obligation of baptism, the Lord's supper, and the Christian ministry, most evangelical congregations might be expected, without severing existing relations, to rally round it. How glorious would be such a spectacle! What a refutation of the superstitious unity of Rome! To render it, indeed, a loving, fervent, affectionate union, the Holy Spirit must be abundantly poured out. No human arrangements, no orthodox confessions, can supersede the necessity for His Divine work. But His operations might be confidently looked for, were the Churches humbly, penitently, and prayerfully to use the means for exhibiting their essential oneness. We believe, therefore, that this object should be one of those contemplated by the expected Conferences.

"III. But, while protesting against Rome, and designing to exhibit the oneness of the Church, the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee consider, that Christians ought also to endeavour to unite, as far as practicable, in disseminating Divine truth in countries where Romanism prevails. The labours of the brethren in France, Belgium, and Switzerland, might be aided through their own societies. The still more wonderful religious movements in Germany—a Country to which England owes its race, its religion, and its dynasty—might be judiciously promoted. And to turn to our own Country, in Ireland, the dissemination of the Word of God, and other simple forms of religious effort, might be undertaken in combination; while societies connected with evangelical communities might be aided, out of a common fund, to spread sound principles among our benighted countrymen. The most incontestable proof would by this means be afforded, that it was not owing to any lack of British affection or generosity, that the Protestant people of these realms have protested against contributing to the Endowment of Romanism.

"The Countries already named are all accessible to our efforts. If grace is given to the Churches to enter these open doors boldly and faithfully, they may subsequently see their way to extend their evangelical operations into the very centre of Romanism itself. Our brethren in the United States are actively engaged in a plan for introducing the Scriptures and scriptural principles into Italy, and especially into Rome. We consider that the Church will not have fulfilled its duty, till, it shall, in some manner, have exerted its utmost efforts, in dependence on the Divine aid, to call upon every Romanist to come out of the great apostacy.

"IV. But in order that 'the Word of the Lord may have free course, and be glorified,' throughout the earth, there is required a revival of the brotherly spirit of the Reformation; and in Roman Catholic kingdoms especially, a great extension

of Religious Liberty. Aforetime in Europe, Protestant Governments, like those of England and Prussia, were accustomed to interpose their influence with the rulers of Roman Catholic countries, for the protection and enfranchisement of their *brethren of the Reformation*. But recent events plainly indicate that a decided change is taking place in the policy of Protestant countries, and that, under God, the main security of such as may come out of Babylon, will be found in the force of sanctified public opinion, and in the sympathy and co-operation of enlightened Christians. But in many Countries of Europe, that public opinion has yet to be created. Little is known of the unspeakable privilege of free access to God's Word; and, with it, of that inalienable birth-right of the soul, freedom of faith in that Word, and worship according to it,—or of the individual and direct responsibility of every man to God, in all that relates to the convictions of his conscience. The liberty of worship, and the free use of the Holy Scriptures, need to be maintained, and the great arguments in favour of these sacred rights of man require to be addressed to the consciences of all men, through every available channel, in many lands. With purely political questions we wish not collectively to interfere; but freedom for Religion must be conceded, before Religion itself can triumph; and we regard it as a subject worthy of our united counsels.

“It is with such views that the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee have determined to accept your invitation from Scotland. We presume that you will invite the Anti-Maynooth Committee for Ireland, to promote the attendance of deputies from the sister Country; and that the principal religious societies of the United Kingdom will be requested to co-operate, so as to render the preliminary assembly of next October, a fair exhibition of the evangelical feelings of England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. At the same time, it strikes us as very important, that persons attending the Conference, should be considered as speaking their own sentiments, and not as committing the communities with which they are connected.

“In conclusion, our Committee wish to urge you to impress on all whom you can influence, the supreme importance of earnest, fervent, and unceasing prayer, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that the God of patience and consolation would grant us to be like-minded one towards another, according to Christ Jesus, that we may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, and strive together for the faith of the Gospel.

“Believe me, dear Sir, with sincere personal respect on account of the part you have taken in promoting the union of Evangelical Christians,

“Your faithful servant for the Saviour's sake,

“CULLING EARDLEY SMITH.

“John Henderson, Esq., Glasgow.”

# LIST OF THE CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE.

**Chairman.**—Sir CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, Bart.

ALDER, Rev. Dr.	DIBDIN, Rev. R. W.	PIZEY, Rev. E.
ARCHER, Rev. Dr.	DRIFFIELD, Rev. T.	PREST, Rev. C.
AURIOL, Rev. E.	ECKETT, Rev. R.	REED, Rev. A., D.D.
BAXTER, N., Esq.	EVANS, J. C., Esq.	ROBBINS, Rev. H.
BEECHAM, Rev. J.	FARMER, T., Esq.	ROBINSON, Rev. J. T.
BENNETT, Rev. Dr.	FINCH, G., Esq.	SCOTT, Rev. J.
BLACKBURN, Rev. JOHN	FREEMAN, Rev. J.	SEELEY, R. B., Esq.
BLANCHARD, H. Esq.	GOAD, C., Esq.	SHERMAN, Rev. JAMES
BRIDGES, J., Esq.	GORDON, A., Esq.	SMITH, G. J. P., Esq.
BUNTING, Rev. Dr.	HALL, Rev. P.	SPICER, J., Esq.
BUNTING, Rev. W. M.	HALL, Rev. S. R.	STAMP, Rev. J.
BURDER, Rev. A.	HAMILTON, Rev. JAMES	STEWART, Dr.
BURNS, Rev. JABEZ	HAMILTON, T. Esq.	STRATFORD, Hon. Col. W.
CADMAN, Rev. W.	HOLLOWAY, Rev. Dr.	THELWALL, Rev. A. S.
CAMPBELL, Rev. G.	HORTON, Rev. J.	THOMAS, Rev. R.
CHALMERS, Rev. W.	HULL, W. W., Esq.	THOMPSON, THOMAS, Esq.
CLARKE, G. ROCHFORD, Esq.	KNIPE, J. A., Esq.	TIDMAN, Rev. A.
CLAYTON, Rev. G.	LEIFCHILD, Rev. Dr.	VAWDREY, Rev. D.
CONDER, JOSIAH, Esq.	MILLS, J. R., Esq.	VILLIERS, Hon. & Rev. H.M.
COX, Rev. J. E.	MORLEY, W., Esq.	WELLS, Rev. A.
CUFFE, Rev. T. TENISON	MORISON, Rev. Dr.	WIRE, D. W., Esq.
CUMMING, Rev. J., D.D.	NOEL, Hon. and Rev. B. W.	WOOD, J., Esq.
CURLING, Rev. W.	PAUL, J. D., Esq., Treasurer	WOODROFFE, —, Esq.
DAY, Rev. C.		

JAMES LORD, Secretary.

[illegible]

## CONFERENCE, &c.

---

### First Sitting,

WEDNESDAY MORNING, APRIL 30, 1845.

---

A LARGE number of Deputies being assembled at eleven o'clock, the members of the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee came into the room to meet them.

The Rev. Dr. HOLLOWAY then rose and said—Gentlemen, I beg leave to propose that Sir Culling Eardley Smith be requested to take the Chair. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING said—It is with a deep sense of the gratitude which I feel, and which I think the meeting will also feel, to Sir Culling Eardley Smith, for his past services in the cause which has assembled us together, and with perfect confidence that he is eminently qualified for the office which Dr. Holloway has proposed that he should fill, that I second the motion.

The question was then submitted to a show of hands, and carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN then said—Gentlemen, I desire cordially to thank you for the honour which you have done me: but, before I make any observations in reference to the question to be considered, permit me to say, that I feel the great importance of this meeting commencing with prayer; and *that* prayer, not merely the prayer which is usual, in opening an ordinary meeting; but a prayer of that solemnity, and met on your part by that devout attention, which are required by the extraordinary and peculiar circumstances under which we are assembled. I will therefore call upon the Rev. Dr. Holloway to open the meeting with prayer.

The Rev. Dr. HOLLOWAY then offered up prayer on behalf of the meeting.

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, your kindness has placed me in an honourable, but in what I feel to be also a very trying position. (Hear, hear.) I should indeed tremble at the responsibility which it involves, if I did not feel that, on a momentous occasion like the present, I can look up to Heaven for guidance and support (hear, hear;) and if I did not feel that, under Him, to whom I look chiefly, I can also look to you for the encouragement of your

sympathy and your support. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, we are met together to-day to discharge a duty as Christians, and to avail ourselves of a right as Englishmen. (Hear, hear.) A great insult, in my opinion, is offered to that religion which, thank God! notwithstanding minor differences, we all hold in common, (hear, hear;) and we have reason to be grateful that we live in a land of freedom, where we can meet together to devise measures by which the evil that we apprehend may be obviated; or by which, if our immediate object should not be gained, we may at least remedy the evil afterwards. (Cheers.) To that object, namely, the devising of plans by which the Endowment of Maynooth may be prevented or disannulled, I conceive that the proceedings of this meeting must be mainly directed. Our time, consistently with the duties and avocations of those whom I address, must necessarily be short; and therefore I feel that it will become me, as your Chairman, to set an example of brevity in opening this meeting. I feel that it will not be necessary to go at any very great length into the merits of this question; for upon that subject we all agree. (Hear, hear.) I imagine that we have less to do with the arguments against the Endowment of Maynooth than with the duties which devolve upon us, in consequence of the Government having proposed that measure. At the same time, I quite foresee, that it will be impossible entirely to avoid the discussion of the topic itself; and that being so, permit me, Gentlemen, to address you on a point which I feel to be one of great delicacy, and in reference to which, I am quite sure, I shall have your patient attention. (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen, it is of the very greatest importance that, in aiming at our common object, we should show an united phalanx. (Hear, hear.) I may therefore be permitted to point out a rock—not upon which we shall—for I feel convinced that through the goodness of God we shall not—but upon which we may—be liable to split, and so to injure our common cause. In contending against the endowment of Popery in the Name of our common Saviour, and in the name of those who have for weeks been working together in perfect harmony and with mutual forbearance, let me entreat those whom I have the pleasure of addressing, to exercise the utmost discretion, the utmost kindness, and the utmost gentleness, in reference to the general question of Religious Establishments. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) In fact, it seems to me, that the less,—consistently with the due expression of what one feels bound to say,—the less any of the speakers refer to that subject, the better will it be for our common object. (Hear, hear.) No Churchman will be suspected for a moment, from his appearance here, of having any doubt as to those principles which, from mature examination and long prayer, he has been led to adopt; and, permit me to add—and I can do it, perhaps, with better grace than a Churchman—that no Voluntary will be suspected for a moment of in any way abandoning the ground which he has occupied, because, in approaching the question whether our Country shall be dishonoured by the recognition of Popery, he does not go at length into that general question, which, I have no doubt, is one of those questions to which the apostle's words apply—"If in anything ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you." (Cheers.) To bring to a practical point the observation which I have ventured to make, allow me to say, that, if any gentleman feels it upon his conscience, in order that he may not be misunder-

stood, to make a reference to his general views, I most earnestly request, that, according to the fundamental basis laid down for this meeting beforehand, the reference may be made simply allusively, and parenthetically. (Hear, hear.) Acting on the principle which I have suggested to others, I proceed at once to say for myself, what others may feel it necessary to say for themselves, that, upon the general question of religious establishments, I still see reason to entertain the opinions which I have hitherto held, (hear, hear;) and I am quite sure that my Church friends will permit me thus to liberate my conscience. (Cheers.)

But I now come to facts. I shall endeavour to state briefly, what circumstances have occurred, with reference to the great question which has now convened us, and what courses appear to the Anti-Maynooth Committee to be open for your consideration and adoption. With regard to the steps which have been taken, I may first say a few words with respect to our action upon the provinces. The Committee have spared neither expense nor effort in order to bring out the real sentiments of the Country. (Hear, hear.) That circular, by which this meeting is convened, was addressed to 27,000 persons; and it was sent out from London, by great exertions, in two consecutive days' posts. We also felt it our duty to engage gentlemen, whose name and position we knew would have influence in the Country; and we induced them to go into the provinces to visit certain districts. I believe that many of those, whom I have the pleasure to see before me, have been led to come here, by the strong representations which were made to them by the friends who, at our request, visited the Country, as I have mentioned. But whilst acting upon the provinces, we have not been indifferent to our duty in the metropolis. (Hear, hear.) Early in this business,—and, in fact, among the first steps we took,—we solicited interviews with the heads of the two great political parties. We went to them, not so much to argue with them the question, as to crave that which, I take leave to say, a constitutional Government and a constitutional Opposition ought to have conceded; namely,—time for the Country to express its opinion. (Hear, hear.) We went to Sir Robert Peel, and to Lord John Russell, with a calculation of the number of petitions which,—from the few data we had before us, and with the limited time that we had had for ascertaining the facts,—we were able to anticipate would come up from the Country; and I may say, in a parenthesis, that the calculation has been already greatly exceeded. (Cheers.) I am sorry to state, what is already notorious to the public, that both at the hand of that Minister who was once the leader of a great party in this country against the recognition of Popery, (hear, hear,) and at the hand of that other individual who was once the leader of a great party in favour of the people's rights—at the hands of both those gentlemen, we met with a peremptory refusal to grant time to the Country; and I feel that I should not discharge my duty, Gentlemen, if I did not add that, on the part of Sir Robert Peel, that refusal was accompanied by the statement, that, in consequence of certain circulars having been sent from London, and that fact having come to his knowledge, he did not attach that importance to the petitions of the people which he would otherwise have done. (Hear, hear.) I think it is right that you should know that fact, (hear, hear;) and I think it is one of the justifications of our assembling to-day, that we are

thus able at once to remove all doubt from the Premier's mind ; inasmuch as he must be perfectly aware, that such an assembly as this is already,—and, still more, such an assembly as this will be before many hours have passed,—could not have come up from the provinces to the metropolis, except under the influence of a spontaneous feeling—under the influence of a feeling which no exertion of ours could have called out, if it had not previously existed. (Hear, and cheers.) I must, while alluding to that subject, take the liberty of stating to you, how I felt it right to answer that observation of Sir Robert Peel.—I said, it was by no means an uncommon thing for the leader of a political party in the House of Commons to summon his own parliamentary adherents to vote on a particular occasion. (Hear, hear.) He would be the first, I venture to say, to blame any person who should throw an imputation upon gentlemen so convened, or to say that they were not acting according to their consciences,—because they expressed their opinion on a particular occasion, when they had been invited to do so. (Hear, hear.)

Gentlemen, I may also add, in reference to our metropolitan proceedings, that several meetings have been held in connexion with the Anti-Maynooth Committee, not to mention scores of meetings which have taken place quite independently of ourselves. One of our meetings was held in Covent Garden Theatre; and, on that occasion, it was resolved, that if, as we had reason to apprehend, the measure passed the Second Reading, it should be an instruction to the Anti-Maynooth Committee, with as little delay as possible, to convene a second meeting. The Anti-Maynooth Committee were also instructed, to take such steps as they might deem desirable to stir up the public mind in the interval. That second meeting was assembled. During the intervening period, the circular was sent out which has reached you all; and at the second meeting—one of the largest and most crowded meetings I ever witnessed in Exeter Hall—the strongest expression of approval of our course was tendered to this Committee.

I now pass from the proceedings of the Committee to a very brief allusion to what has taken place in Parliament. It is notorious, that, notwithstanding the strong expression of opinion out of doors, this measure has been pushed on with, what I cannot help thinking to be, indecent haste. (Hear, hear.) The measure has been hurried on through successive stages in Parliament; and one of the most extraordinary phenomena that the House of Commons ever witnessed has been exhibited during its progress. Member after Member has got up, acknowledging that the sense of his constituents is most decidedly against the measure; and yet he has proceeded,—not only without hesitation as to the principle itself, but without any hesitation as to the time when the Bill shall be proceeded with,—to force on this obnoxious measure, in spite of the acknowledged sentiments of the Country. Gentlemen, if this be a Representative Government, I do not know what the representation of the people means. (Hear, hear.) When the feeling of the Country is so unanimous as it is on all hands admitted to be, I think that common respect for public opinion ought at least to have secured, that time should be given to the Country fully to express its sentiments.

Gentlemen, this slight reference to the circumstances which have occurred, has prepared the way for laying before you in general terms, some of the points



to which we feel that your attention must be directed on this occasion. One of the first subjects to which we felt that your attention ought to be directed,—and upon which, up to last night, we intended to propose that it should be directed,—was the propriety of seeking a conference on the part of this assembly—or, rather, on the part of a deputation from it—with the Prime Minister of the Country. This letter was addressed to Sir Robert Peel last Monday.

“*Central Anti-Maynooth Committee,*  
“*London Coffee-House, Ludgate-Hill, April 28, 1845.*”

“Sir Culling Eardley Smith presents his compliments to Sir Robert Peel, and begs, at the request of this Committee, to state that Deputations from various parts of the Country, on the subject of the Endowment of Maynooth, are expected to arrive in London on Wednesday next.

“Some members of these Deputations will be glad to have the honour of an interview with Sir Robert Peel on Thursday, if that day should be convenient; in which case, Sir Culling Smith would be obliged by Sir Robert Peel fixing an hour when it will be in his power to receive them.

“The Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, &c.”

To the letter which I have read, this answer has been received:—

“*Whitehall, April 29, 1845.*”

“Sir Robert Peel presents his compliments to Sir Culling Eardley Smith, and, in reply to his note of yesterday, begs leave to decline receiving the parties referred to by Sir Culling Eardley Smith,” (loud cries of Shame, and hisses,) “who wish for an interview with Sir Robert Peel on the subject of the Endowment of Maynooth.

“That subject has undergone the consideration of the House of Commons during ten nights of debate; and Sir Robert Peel feels it to be wholly out of his power, consistently with the proper discharge of the official duties he has to perform, to discuss in personal conference, out of Parliament, the merits of measures of general public policy, not specially affecting particular or local interests.”

(Renewed cries of Shame.)

Upon that letter I shall not make any comments myself, because I feel that it will be for you to deal with it. (Renewed marks of disapprobation.) I will merely make this single observation,—that, if Sir Robert Peel felt it consistent with his duty, some days ago, to receive a Deputation from London, when the feeling against the Maynooth Bill was yet in its infancy, it does seem to me, *à fortiori*, that he ought to have been ready to receive a Deputation from the whole Empire, when this feeling is almost universal. (Loud cheers.) Before I leave the subject of Sir Robert Peel’s letter, I think it right to state, that this Resolution has been passed by the Committee this morning, as preparatory to any step which you may think it desirable to take:—

“Resolved,—That it is a matter of the deepest regret and surprise to this Committee, that Sir Robert Peel has not deemed it consistent with his public duty to receive a Deputation of gentlemen, who would have been able to prove to him the fact, that the whole of the Country, as well as of the Metropolis, are most decidedly against the Endowment of Maynooth; and that this Resolution be respectfully transmitted to Sir Robert Peel.”

That is the proceeding we have taken upon the subject,—leaving it to you, as I have said, to take what other step you may deem desirable.

A second point, to which it is desirable that your attention should be directed, is—the necessity of making representations, similar to those which we have made to the Prime Minister, to the Representatives of the people in Parliament. With that view, we propose that a small committee shall be appointed, in order to facilitate arrangements for gentlemen, who may be disposed to wait upon their Representatives, and to state to them the feeling of the Country; and it will be the duty of that committee to record the results of the interviews which take place, in order that they may be referred to on any future occasion. (Cheers.) We also feel that, besides dealing with our Representatives in Parliament, it is our duty to take some step or other to express our sentiments to that noble branch of the legislature, which has, in many a crisis, stood by the people,—I allude to the House of Lords. (Great cheers.) We must never forget—I hope neither dissenters nor churchmen will forget—that there are many in that august assembly who are placed there officially as the defenders of the Protestant religion;—I allude to the Bishops of the Church of England. (Hear, and cheers.) I do hope and trust, that they will justify to the people those expectations, and that confidence, in reference to them, which many of us are disposed to entertain; and that they will occupy the van in resisting this invasion of the common Protestantism of our Country. (Cheers.)

There is another subject, Gentlemen, for your consideration; and that is, the course which it will be your duty to adopt,—contemplating the contingency of this measure passing the House of Commons and the House of Lords. (Hear, hear.) “Forewarned is forearmed;” and our measures, in order to be successful, must be devised and prepared beforehand. (Hear, hear.) It certainly does seem to myself, without committing any individual whom I have the honour of addressing, (and I beg to say, that nothing like a cut-and-dry preparation has been made for you before you came here,) it does seem to me, I say, that, with regard to that serious contingency which may possibly arise, this Conference will not have done its duty, if, in some shape or other, it does not provide for an appeal being made to Her Majesty,—that, before this measure passes into a law, the people may be consulted, and have an opportunity afforded to them at the hustings, of declaring their opinion. (Renewed cheers.) Gentlemen, if a deputation cannot go to Whitehall, I hope that cheering will go there. (Laughter.) I do think that, if this Conference should feel it to be its duty to take the step which I have mentioned, a Prime Minister who should advise his young and confiding sovereign to despise the unanimous sentiments of an affectionate Protestant nation, would incur a degree of responsibility, for which—if the penalty should not be paid by more immediate consequences as regards his official position—at all events history would do justice to the question, (cheers;) and the Prime Minister who had thus—not only, in the first instance, affronted the conscientious convictions of the people—but afterwards refused any full opportunity to the people to express their opinions, would go down to posterity, linked with the name of such a statesman as Bolingbroke, who altered the religion of Scotland, by Act of Parliament, in one short fortnight, and to whom posterity and history have done justice. (Cheers.)

Gentlemen, another question to which your attention should be directed, as distinguished from the question, Whether in certain contingencies you should endeavour to accelerate a general Election, is, What course you will feel it to be your duty to take, with reference to that general Election, whenever it may happen. Now, Gentlemen, this is a most difficult and delicate point; and one with which, I am sure, this Conference will deal, with that caution, and with that mutual forbearance, which so difficult a question requires at their hands. It seems to me to be impracticable for those, who, loving the same Saviour, and united in the same faith, yet differ to a great extent upon the mode in which religious questions should be dealt with by Parliament, to agree to take steps, by which any conjoint influence may be brought to bear upon each locality at the next general Election. But I do think, and I throw it out as a general hint, that we may come to some understanding, embodied in any shape which may be deemed best, as to what should be the general course of Christian men, whenever the next general Election shall take place. (Hear, hear.) I would be the last to compliment away my political or ecclesiastical convictions; and I think that no Christian man ought to be, or will be, expected to do so. (Cheers.) But I say this frankly, that—as between a man with whom I generally concur in politics, but who is prepared to vote for the endowment of Popery,—and a man with whose politics I do to a great extent disagree, but who is prepared to say that he will not consent to his Country participating in that national guilt, I, for one, should have no difficulty in deciding what course to pursue at a general Election. (Cheers.) I should vote for the Christian—(renewed cheers)—for the man who is prepared to stand by our national profession of Christianity. (Cheers.) It seems to me, that some practical steps may be adopted, in order to the embodying and carrying out of that general principle; and I should greatly rejoice, if, whilst steps were being taken with a view to this practical object, the movement might be the foundation of a great Protestant league and covenant, (cheers); that, whilst we respect one another's sentiments, and desire to concede to one another full liberty upon those points on which we differ, we are determined to act together whenever we can; and, even when our paths separate, to impute to each other none but the best motives; and further, that we are determined, as far as in us lies, to prevent others from stigmatising, or speaking evil of, the course which any other Christian brother may think fit conscientiously to pursue. (Cheers.)

Gentlemen, I have thus slightly alluded to some of the topics which I think should occupy your attention. I will now proceed to some of the matters of business which must immediately engage it. According to the Agenda paper which has been put into my hands, it is proposed, that our first proceedings should be the appointment of Committees and Officers. It is suggested that Secretaries should be appointed for this Conference, selected partly from London and partly from the Country; and that there should also be a Conference Committee, a Parliamentary Committee, and a Ticket Committee. It is also proposed, in order that there may not be the shadow of an idea in the mind of any person present, that our proceedings have been prepared beforehand, and that Resolutions have been got ready, to which you are asked to give your adhesion merely because

they have been prepared ;—in order to avoid any suspicion of that kind, it is proposed that this morning's sitting shall be chiefly occupied in such a proceeding as this :—that the Chairman should mention the names of some of the leading places in the Empire, and that gentlemen from those places should be asked to stand up, and state what is the general feeling in their respective localities. By that means, valuable information will be obtained, and time will be secured, during which the Committee of your own appointment may prepare Resolutions for your subsequent meetings. It is also thought, that some steps might be taken, or that we might come to some conclusion, with respect to the adoption of Memorials. It is conceived that something like an Address to the people of England should be prepared; and it has been thought, that it would be well if some Address were to go forth from this Conference to the people of Ireland. It is important that, during the present sitting, your attention should be directed to the subject of Finance. I need not say that considerable expenditure has taken place. We have had no hesitation in incurring it, because we have felt quite certain that the public will support us. It is further thought that, without any appearance, or reality, of dictation on our part, it should be suggested to our friends of different Christian communions, that they should, according to their convenience, set apart some day for prayer and humiliation. (Hear, hear.) Let me conclude by expressing to you my strong conviction, that *that* is the quarter in which our strength lies. We have been taught by passing events to "cease from man." I believe there is not an individual in this room, who does not feel at this moment disappointed, with regard to the conduct of some public men or party. That being the case, my friends, what is the great lesson which God in his providence is teaching us? It is—that we should throw ourselves upon Him; that, in subordination to that, we should clasp each other's hands with Christian confidence: but that, paramountly and especially, we should throw ourselves upon Him, who is ever ready to hear the prayer of individuals for their individual wants: and, whilst doing this, we may fully rely, both from the declarations of His Word, and from our experience in times past, that He will never be wanting to any nation, or to any church, that in confidence and humility throws itself upon Him. (Loud cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. REED proposed the following Resolution:—"That John Dean Paul, Esq., be requested to undertake the office of Treasurer to this Conference."

The Rev. C. PREST seconded the Resolution, which was carried unanimously.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—It was proposed that a Conference Committee should be appointed, to take charge of the general business of the Conference, and that the following gentlemen, who should have power to add to their number, should constitute that Committee:—The Rev. Thomas Scales, Rev. E. Pizey, Rev. C. Prest, Rev. Dr. Reed, Rev. W. Chalmers, Rev. J. Blackburn, Rev. W. Pattison, Rev. R. Echett, Rev. Dr. Holloway, Rev. Dr. Halley, Edward Baines, Esq., R. B. Seeley, Esq., and Mr. Alderman Kershaw.

The Resolution having been seconded, was unanimously agreed to.

The following gentlemen were then appointed as the Ticket Committee:—The Rev. E. Pizey, the Rev. John Blackburn, and the Rev. T. Scales.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—It has been suggested that a Parliamentary Com-

mittee should be appointed, whose duty it should be to give information to deputies, in connexion with that branch of their operations. For that department of service, Messrs. R. B. Seeley, W. W. Hull, J. D. Paul, and the Rev. S. R. Hall are proposed.

This nomination also received the sanction of the meeting.

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—I have great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in proposing a list of the names of gentlemen who are requested, and I believe will kindly consent, to act as Secretaries to the present Conference. Those names, which have been selected partly from London and partly from the Country, are the following :—

Rev. J. T. Robinson, Rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn ;

Rev. Charles Prest, Wesleyan Minister, St. George's East ;

Rev. Thomas Scales, Pastor of the Independent Church, Queen-street Chapel, Leeds ;

Rev. Wm. Chalmers, Presbyterian Church, Edward-street ;

T. P. Bunting, Esq., of Manchester ;

Rev. J. H. M'Guire, Incumbent of St. John's, Manchester ;

Rev. Andrew Reed, D.D., Pastor of the Independent Church, Wycliffe Chapel, London.

The Rev. J. BLACKBURN.—I rise to second that Resolution ; and in doing so, I beg to call the attention of the meeting to the fact, that our object has been to select gentlemen, who represent large sections of the public interested in these proceedings. There are Clergymen, Independents, Wesleyans, and Presbyterians—who, whether coming from London or the Country, have already proved their zeal in this cause. (Hear, hear.)

The motion was carried unanimously.

The Rev. Dr. REED then stated the prospective arrangements as to the sittings of the Conference. He said it was proposed that the morning sitting should continue until three, and that the Conference should reassemble at six. The arrangements for the following day would be stated in the evening. It had been expected that the morning would be given to Sir Robert Peel ; but, as that plan was now set aside, it was thought that a part of the morning should be devoted to visiting Members of Parliament. The arrangement respecting the hour of the next morning session might, therefore, be left until the evening.

The CHAIRMAN.—We have now come, Gentlemen, to that very interesting portion of our business which relates to statements from the Country as to the feeling which exists in different localities. (Hear, hear.) We expect deputations from all the places the names of which I shall read. I will first read in order the names of some of the leading places, from which we know that Deputations will be present. I will then go over them seriatim, in order that, as many gentlemen have not yet arrived, some who represent the first place which has a representative here already may get up and address the Conference. I will first read the names of the places, from which we hope to receive statements, through Deputies, in the course of the morning. Edinburgh, Dublin, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, Leicester, Cheltenham, Bristol, Bath, North and South Wales, Exeter, Truro, Leamington, Shrewsbury. Let me first ask whether any gentleman is

present, and prepared to give us information from Edinburgh? under which head I shall include Leith.

The Rev. J. ROBERTSON, of Edinburgh.—Sir, I shall endeavour to be as brief as possible in my remarks. I will state for the information of the meeting, in the first place, that there is almost entire unanimity of feeling in Edinburgh, with regard to the impropriety of this proceeding on the part of her Majesty's Government, and also with respect to the impropriety of the conduct of those who profess to be our Representatives. (Hear, hear.) I am prepared to say, with respect to the latter, that there is little likelihood—unless they undergo a very great change in their opinions—of their ever again occupying the position, in reference to that City, in which they have been placed. (Cheers.) I hope, as one of the Deputation from Edinburgh, to wait on those gentlemen; and to have an opportunity of stating especially to the eloquent Mr. Macaulay, that we consider his speech, in the first place, as in the highest degree—shall I say immoral?—(hear, hear,)—at all events as advocating religious views which we entirely condemn; and, in the second place, as decidedly illogical as it is immoral. (Hear, hear.) We trust that, although we may not be successful in converting that gentleman to our opinions, we shall at all events produce some salutary influence on his mind; and that the combined action of so many dealing with their Representatives, will tell favourably upon the next Election. It appears that great anxiety oppresses the minds of many in this Country, who are anxious to prevent the Endowment of Popery, on account of this circumstance,—that there is the greatest difficulty, in consequence of the diversity of opinion which prevails, in maintaining that union, by which, if possible, the present movement should be characterised. Now, I do not know what may be the case this morning, but I think it proper to state, that we who represent Edinburgh (although we belong to different denominations) are entirely united with respect to the question before us. The Rev. Dr. Greville belongs to the Episcopalian church, Mr. Campbell belongs to an Independent chapel, and I have on my right hand gentlemen who belong to other bodies. We have had many meetings, both private and public, on this subject, and we have always been unanimous in the findings to which we have come. (Hear, hear.) Allow me to state, how it happens that, notwithstanding our diversities of opinion, we have thus been enabled to attain unanimity. I think this a point of great importance. The manner in which we have proceeded is this. We hold different opinions with regard to Establishments; and those opinions we are determined to state frankly and fully, in private and in public, when we consider that circumstances demand it. Understanding each other with regard to this matter, and being determined at the proper time to express our views,—the one party as Voluntaries, the other as maintaining the theory of an Establishment,—we are determined to take care that, in the findings to which we come on this subject, we limit ourselves to opposition to the Maynooth Grant. If we confine ourselves to this,—if, though we fully and frankly express our difference of opinion, we do not embark in any discussion, on which there may exist a difference of opinion,—if we confine our union to resisting the common enemy,—we may, by such means, be enabled to reduce him to the dust of death. Let the Conference

proceed on this principle, and there is no reason whatever why it should be disturbed by anything like controversy ; let those gentlemen who speak have the utmost latitude ; let us confide in their Christian experience ; let them speak briefly, and let us further take care that the Resolutions which we adopt shall bear upon these two points—first, the preventing the Government, if possible, from carrying the measure ; and secondly, in the event of its being carried, the doing what we can in order to obtain its repeal. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. R. K. GREVILLE, of the Episcopalian body in Scotland.—I am not going to occupy the time of this meeting, by adding any observation of my own in reference to the mode of conducting our proceedings. On that subject I entirely concur in what has fallen from my colleague. (Hear, hear.) I wish to state, as a matter of local information, that a great Anti-Maynooth demonstration was appointed to take place in Edinburgh yesterday. The history of the matter is this. Mr. Alexander Dunlop was induced to come forward as a candidate for Greenock, on the ground of opposition to Maynooth. His Election was lost only by six votes ; and there is every reason to believe, that, had he been in the field only a few hours earlier, the triumph of our cause in that town would have been secured. An entertainment was to have been given to him yesterday ; but the character of the whole proceeding was changed : it was determined to make the occasion a great Anti-Maynooth demonstration. (Cheers.) From what I know of the general feeling in Edinburgh, I may be permitted to state, that we are quite prepared to get up an extensively-signed Memorial, praying for the Dissolution of Parliament, should the present Conference deem that the most eligible mode of procedure. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. G. CULLEN.—As you have kindly connected me with Edinburgh, allow me to say, that we have indeed been acting with the perfect unanimity to which reference has already been made. We have been perfectly cordial and united in opposition to this measure. There have been two public meetings of the Protestant inhabitants of Leith, consisting of members of Protestant congregations holding different opinions on the great question of Religious Establishments. In all of those meetings, we were, as I have stated, cordially united on the question before us. We were assembled for three or four hours ; and, although the speakers were persons holding different views on certain subjects, the meeting passed off without the slightest disturbance or interruption. I have the honour of representing in this Conference the inhabitants of Leith, who are most decidedly opposed to the measure before Parliament. I am not sure that I shall be able to fulfil the instructions which I have received from my constituents, by waiting on our Member, Mr. Rutherford. They have instructed me to tell him, that he has misrepresented their opinions ; and, from what I know of our esteemed Representative, I do hope that he will be greatly influenced by the knowledge of the religious feeling which prevails in the town of Leith upon this subject. It is for him to consider the consequences of his present conduct as regards his Election ; and not for me, as a minister of the Gospel, to point out to him what those consequences will be. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN.—I will now call on gentlemen from another Capital of great importance, to speak in reference to this question,—I mean Dublin.

The names of the following gentlemen, comprising the deputation from

Dublin, were announced from the chair :—the Venerable Archdeacon Magee, the Rev. Hugh E. Prior, the Rev. T. D. Gregg, T. Thompson, Esq., the Rev. Joseph Coleman, the Rev. J. Cadwell, and Dr. Blackwood.

The Venerable Archdeacon MAGEE.—I have been most unexpectedly called upon to appear before this vast assembly. Having arrived in London only last night, I am come here merely as a friend of the cause, and not to represent any particular part of the Protestant Establishment in Ireland. I appear before you as the rector of a Dublin parish ; and happy am I to tell you, that no feelings of difference whatever exist, in reference to this question, among the Protestants of all denominations in the large parish of which I have the charge. (Hear, hear.) As I find myself placed in this prominent position, I will state to the meeting a fact of some importance. My father, the late Archbishop of Dublin, had on one occasion a conversation with Sir Robert Peel, which clearly goes to prove, that Sir Robert Peel entertained Romanising views with regard to my Country, as far back as the period when he acted as Secretary for Ireland. (Hear, hear.) A remarkable conversation occurred between my father, before he was Archbishop of Dublin, and Sir Robert Peel, at the Castle of Dublin,—when Sir Robert Peel urged, that it would be beneficial to the Empire, if the Church of England should be confined to England, the Church of Scotland to Scotland, and the Church of Rome to Ireland. (Hear, hear.) That fact I think is quite sufficient. (Cheers.)

The Rev. TRESHAM D. GREGG.—Mr. Chairman, I feel myself placed in an embarrassing position, when rising before an assembly so remarkable for intelligence and piety as the present. With reference to the state of feeling in Dublin, permit me to say, that I entirely concur in the statement of the Venerable Archdeacon Magee. I am happy, in the most decided manner, to controvert the idea, which has gone abroad with respect to Ireland in general, and to Dublin in particular, with reference to this measure. It has been industriously stated, that either there is apathy and indifference with respect to the measure, or else an extensive approval of it, on the part of the Protestants of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) With the best possible information, with the largest opportunity of understanding the Protestant mind of Ireland, I protest that any such idea is entirely unfounded. (Hear, hear.) The measure is utterly abominable in the eyes of those who call themselves the Protestants of Ireland, and who constitute the great body of that people. Their most earnest aspirations and prayers are, that it may be rejected. (Cheers.) You, Mr. Chairman, gave utterance to a statement, a short time since, which has been taken hold of, and has been urged by the Protestants of Ireland, in reference to this destructive measure. That statement was, that there was a small minority of faithful men in Parliament, some of whom have resolved that they will die on the floor of the House, rather than see this measure become law. (Cheers.) I can tell you that there is a general apprehension, that, if such faithfulness be not manifested on the floor of Parliament,—that, if there be not exhibited that faithfulness which will take hold of every means which Providence has placed in the hands of legislators, to impede a course of legislative conduct which is opposed to the minds and religious feelings of the masses of this Country,—and that if, through the want of such faithfulness, this measure should be allowed to pass, the consequences may be fatal ; for it is apprehended that, if such a course be not adopted,



and the measure should once become law, the feeling which is now so providentially awakened on the subject may cool before the next Election, (loud cries of "No, no;") and that that which has now been done will hereafter require to be done again. (Continued cries of "No, no.") I rejoice to hear expressions of dissent from that opinion; but thus much we do know, that the future is a contingency, and that, if there be the power and the will now to reject it, the danger will at once be obviated, and we shall be delivered from the impending evil. (Hear, hear.) To those individuals of whom you spoke, the Protestants of Ireland look with most anxious expectation. They do trust that, inasmuch as Amendments may be proposed on almost every line of the Bill, Amendments will be brought forward *seriatim*, and *seriatim* be made matter of deliberation, of division, and of impediment, (cheers;) that the faithful men, to whom you referred, will despise the imputation of faction, when it may almost be said—I speak it with great tenderness, and with no feeling which is not consistent with the most perfect loyalty—when, I say, it may almost be said, that the conduct of the Government itself would seem to be the conduct of a faction. (Cheers.) Farther, I beg to state, that it is the feeling of the people of Dublin, that if this measure be passed, it will aggravate more than ever the Repeal cry of the day; for if the Legislature, by such an act as this, should withdraw its protest against Popery—teaching those doctrines which itself has deprecated, and thus indicate that those doctrines are right—will it not stamp with gross injustice every single act of British history towards Ireland in past times, and put a powerful argument into the mouth of O'Connell, to show that nothing save disunion from Great Britain can save Ireland from its tyranny? (Hear, hear.) That sentiment prevails extensively, I say, in Dublin; and we all look with anxiety to this Conference. I am a member of the Anti-Maynooth Committee in that city, and I am connected with some of the largest organisations of Protestants. We look to this Central London Anti-Maynooth Committee for instruction, advice, counsel, and direction. Our present feeling is,—and I am desirous of urging it on you in the strongest manner,—that you should not fail to adopt measures to retard, procrastinate, impede, and utterly prevent the Maynooth Bill from passing into law. (Hear, hear.) I tell you further, that a feeling prevails in Dublin, that there is not much to be expected from the House of Lords. They apprehend, that that House is greatly under the influence of the Government, through the Duke of Wellington; consequently it is felt, that it is on the motion for the Third Reading that the fight must take place; and that the great object of this Conference should be, to impress on those Members who are opposed to the measure, the necessity of proposing such a series of Amendments as must impede the Bill, and thus prevent it from passing through the Commons' House of Parliament. I have thus briefly stated the feelings of those whom I represent; and I beg to thank the assembly for the kindness they have manifested towards me. (Cheers.)

THOMAS THOMPSON, Esq. of Dublin, Secretary of the Anti-Maynooth Committee in that City.—Allow me, Sir, to say, that, not only is the feeling of opposition to this Maynooth measure prevalent in Dublin, but it also pervades all parts of Ireland. (Cheers.) Irish Protestants have come to me, as the Secretary of the Anti-Maynooth Committee in Ireland, and

stated that, if there had been time, petitions would have poured in from the Protestants in all directions, and that even the signatures attached to those petitions which had been presented against the Bill would have been doubled, and in some cases trebled, had a sufficient period elapsed.

The Rev. JOSEPH COLEMAN.—I beg leave to state, that we feel ourselves to be placed in a proud position in Dublin; inasmuch as all our Representatives are, to a man, opposed to this grant to Maynooth. (Cheers.) The two Members who represent our Town, the two Members who represent the University, and the two Members who represent the County of Dublin, are all, like ourselves, opposed to this measure. (Hear, hear.) As Irish Protestants, I may say, we deserve your sympathy and your prayers. We stand in the forefront of the battle. We have held our position since the days, when he who has been called the Dutch Stadtholder came over to defend our rights. The spirit of our forefathers is in us; and, though maligned and insulted,—though our clergy have been shot and murdered in different parts of Ireland,—we have still held our ground, and still maintained those principles which I trust every person here would rather die than sacrifice. (Cheers.) The County with which I am connected is Wicklow; and I am happy to tell you, that there is no man there, who bears the name of Protestant, but cherishes in his heart the principles which are dear to this Conference. Every Protestant there is true to his colours. (Cheers.) Our Representative, Col. Acton, is a Christian in heart, and is true to his profession: and, while referring to this gentleman, I would entreat the whole Protestant body to take their stand as Christians; and to resolve to return only men who are also Christians, to represent them in the House of Commons. No man who is not a Christian,—no man who has not the love of God in his soul,—will lift up the standard of the Lord, when wickedness like a flood comes in to deluge our land. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. MORISON, Independent Minister, of London.—Although, Sir, I am sure we shall all be glad to hear our friends from every quarter, I think it must be clear to the judgment of all present, that it will be quite impossible to get through our business, if we hear more than two persons from one place. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. HUGH E. PRIOR.—I promise this meeting, that I shall not infringe on the general and useful rule of brevity. I merely wish to add my testimony, as the humblest of a Deputation from the Anti-Maynooth Committee of Ireland, to the fact, that Irish Protestants are united as one man against the great Goliath of Popery; and, although we have but the sling and stone of the Word of God in our hands, and—although we are not gathered together in such multitudinous assemblages as yourselves, and cannot show, among different sections of Protestants, such a numerous array—yet, possessing the Word of God in all its simplicity, and without any admixture of Tractarianism whatever, we do not fear the result. (Cheers.) I can assure this meeting also of the fact, that there is in Ireland a most interesting body of converts from the church of Rome. (Cheers.) You cannot be so well acquainted with that fact as ourselves; but it is a fact which I have not the least hesitation in asserting. Yes, Sir, the work of conversion is going on in Ireland, throughout the length and breadth of the land, (cheers,) as many

parts of Ireland can testify ; and I may inform you, from my own experience, that the most forward, the most zealous, the most eager opponents of this Bill of Sir Robert Peel, for the Endowment of Popery, are the converts from Popery. (Cheers.) I wish also to state, that there exists the most perfect unanimity between the Churchmen and the Dissenters of Ireland. We have but one great enemy in that Country ; and that is the enemy against whom we are assembled here this day to bear our testimony. (Cheers.) I am desirous of stating the fact, that there were held, in one week, in Dublin two important meetings, for the purpose of petitioning Parliament against the Endowment of Maynooth. Both those meetings were numerous and respectably attended ; and if this Conference had heard the display of eloquence made on one of these occasions, especially by our valued and reverend friend Mr. M'Ghee, they would have learned from it, as from a voice ineffable, the feelings of the Protestants of Ireland. (Hear, hear.) I wish to call your attention to one interesting circumstance, communicated by a dear friend since I crossed the Channel. It is—that that truly Christian church, which is called the Moravian Church,—the members of which are accustomed at the beginning of each year to select a watchword for that year,—did, by the guidance of Providence, select, to commence the present year, a watchword which seems peculiarly applicable to the present time. It is the ninth verse of the sixth chapter of Nehemiah, “ For they all made us afraid, saying, Their hands shall be weakened from the work, that it be not done. Now therefore, O God, strengthen my hands.” Oh, Sir, may not this be our watchword against the Sanballats and the Tobiahs of the day ? (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—The next place which I shall name is Liverpool ; and I am quite sure, that you will all anticipate the person whom we may expect to address us from that town.

The Rev. HUGH M'NEILE, of Liverpool, then came forward, and was received with immense applause. He said—Sir, whatever apprehensions may have been entertained concerning the cause of the British Reformation, I think they must be dissipated now. (Cheers.) I have ceased to fear for the Protestant Reformation within this realm ; because I believe that, as it could not have been effected by the higher powers, without the co-operation of the bulk of the population, so neither, against the bulk of the population, can it be revoked by those powers. (Cheers.) We have heard, Sir, or rather we have read, that one Representative of the people after another has risen, and (as I think you, Sir, observed) with the full consciousness of opposition to the body of his constituents pressing upon his mind, has nevertheless persevered in making his speech, and giving his vote, in defiance of the known wishes of those who had sent him to Parliament. Now, Sir, the opposition expected, and which may still be made available in the later proceedings on the Bill in Committee, may be carried to a very great extent by Members availing themselves of the orders of the House. And I would ask you, Sir, who, I have no doubt, are competent to give a satisfactory answer,—I would ask any legal gentleman who may have joined this Conference to-day,—I would ask any parliamentary gentleman who may read and mark what is passing on this occasion,—why were those forms arranged ? (Hear, hear.) For what purpose do the forms of the House exist ? Not, I think, to be acted

upon on ordinary occasions, when to avail oneself of a mere form might have the appearance of faction. (Hear, hear.) Why do such forms exist, except to meet an extraordinary case like this? (Hear, hear.) The forms are there, as a protection to the Country against any tyrant majority which might happen to be found in that House. (Great cheering.) Therefore, Sir, I would very respectfully suggest to our friends in that House—and I will mention one who has intimated his intention to avail himself of these forms,—I mean the honourable member for Newcastle, Mr. Colquhoun, (cheers)—that, instead of exposing themselves to the charge of factiousness, by availing themselves of the forms of the House under existing circumstances, they would, if they neglected to resort to them, expose themselves to the charge of having lost sight of the constitutional power lodged, for a great crisis like this, in the hands of a parliamentary minority. (Cheers.) But, Sir, the immediate object for which you have invited me to address this assembly is, to report progress with regard to the state of things in that large city (for I may call it a city, though it is not technically entitled to the name) where I have the honour to reside. I have great pleasure, Sir, in reporting from Liverpool decided unanimity upon this question. This unanimity has not been manifested in united meetings, like those held in Edinburgh and other places. The meetings of different religious bodies have been held separately; but the same principles have been advocated; and men, who are not in the habit of agreeing, have, on this question, been entirely united; so that it has been a common observation, as we have met our friends in the street, “Well, you are in the same boat at last.” (Laughter and cheers.) Sir, the cause of Protestantism has united the crew; and, if the crew be united, the boat will not perish. (Great applause.) When this matter was first brought before Parliament, a noble lord, who is one of the representatives of the Borough from whence I came to this assembly, (hisses) intimated, in the course of his speech, that he intended to support the measure proposed by her Majesty’s ministers, on the ground of an existing compact that the College of Maynooth should be maintained. I felt it my duty, Sir, to the public, to ask the noble lord, Where the compact was to be found? (Hear, hear, and laughter.) I confined my inquiry simply to that point. I asked, “Where is it—when was it made—what are the words of it?” (Hear, hear.) It is known to you all, that no answer was given to this question. (Laughter.) A letter indeed was written; but I may truly say, it was no answer to my inquiry,—because it was simply a postponement of his lordship’s answer, until he should state it in his place in Parliament. I took the liberty of sending a rejoinder to his lordship’s letter, in which I stated briefly, the ground of our opposition to the measure: not faction, nor party: we were then rising to manifest the ascendancy of true religion above party. (Cheers.) So far as party was concerned, we were sacrificing everything: and, Sir, I hope there is no man in this Country who is not prepared to sacrifice everything of the nature of party, rather than—either directly or indirectly, by compact or by tacit consent—give any semblance of adhesion to such a measure as would saddle upon this Nation the support of doctrines which are opposed to the word of our common God; which make nothing of the sacrifice of our common Saviour; which, by holding out impunity in sin,—on the ground of indulgences ministered by man to his fellow-man,—from

pains to be incurred after death, do minister to the inherent love of sin in the human heart; and lead man to continue in sin, in the hope that, eventually, he may be rescued by prayers and by masses, not paid for by himself but by his descendants, after he has been laid in his grave. (Loud cheers.) I have further to tell you, Sir, that in consequence of that correspondence, a large meeting was convened in Liverpool, which was addressed both by laymen and clergymen. That meeting consisted of at least 4000 persons. It was held in a great amphitheatre, where the parties assembled were not confined to the area of a room, or to a floor however large,—but where there was tier above tier of boxes and galleries, the theatre being turned to a better use than I ever saw a theatre turned to before. (Laughter.) The report of that meeting is before the public. There was also a large meeting held by Dissenters of various denominations, who joined us cordially in our great object; and I believe as great unity of sentiment pervaded the whole meeting, as if all those composing it had belonged to one denomination. (Cheers.) And, Sir, this is not all. There is a large body of very influential persons in the town of Liverpool, whom we technically and habitually call Protestant operatives. (Hear, hear.) (A very good name—a name to which, I hope, we shall all show ourselves, in some measure, entitled.) (Hear, hear.) A meeting of Protestant operatives was also convened. That meeting was one of the most enthusiastic that it has ever been my privilege to address; and it wound up with the adoption of a declaration, that no Candidate for the representation of that Borough in Parliament was entitled to the confidence of a Protestant constituency who would not zealously oppose the Endowment of Popery. (Cheers.) Sir, that meeting, being held on Monday, was adjourned until the same day in the following week. By that time the declaration had received the signatures of 1000 electors, and I have since heard that the names of another 1000 have been appended to it. Large, therefore, as was the majority at the last general Election in Liverpool, there is now a list of names appended to the declaration I have mentioned, sufficient to turn any contested Election in that Borough. (Cheers.) But, Sir, I have to tell you, that there are some friends of the measure in the town of Liverpool. A petition in its favour has been got up in Liverpool; and I heard before I left, that that petition had received somewhere about 1000 signatures; some of the names being those of very respectable merchants. But I have the pleasure to inform you, and this assembly, that the friends of the measure did not venture upon a meeting—(laughter)—they called no public assembly; they merely circulated a petition; and what petition, I would ask, in such a mixed community as this,—what petition, on almost any subject, would not receive some signatures in such a population? Now I consider that a petition signed by 1000 persons, in a population of 260,000, and signed without the holding of any public meeting, and without any appeal to popular feeling, scarcely deserves to be named as an exception to the unanimity which prevails in that Town. I have great pleasure in making this brief report; and, before I sit down, I certainly cannot refrain from expressing my very grateful thanks for the kind manner in which I have been received by this influential assembly.

The CHAIRMAN.—One of the gentlemen connected with the Dissenting bodies of Liverpool will shortly address the meeting.

The Rev. JOHN JAMES, Wesleyan minister of Liverpool.—The call which has been made is quite unexpected: I shall only say, therefore, that the members of the body in Liverpool, which I have the honour to represent here to-day, and of which there are several representatives in the room, are of one heart and one mind, so far as my knowledge extends without a single exception, in opposition to this measure.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think if I name Manchester, it will bring to your minds the name of a gentleman whom you will be very glad to hear upon this question.

Loud cries were made for Mr. Stowell and for Dr. Halley; but the latter gentleman having proposed that the former should be heard first,—

The Rev. HUGH STOWELL rose and said—My remarks, Sir Culling, shall be few, and, I trust, to the point. (Hear, hear.) It may perhaps be allowed me to make a single observation, that will appear not directly to refer to the place to which I have the privilege and honour to belong; that remark is, that we may “thank God and take courage” on beholding such an assemblage as the present, and say, “Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.” (Cheers.) Who could have foreseen or foretold, when we were—so conscientiously, I doubt not, and so intensely—opposed to each other on the subject of a general system of education, that not a year should go by until we should be thus assembled, with one heart, one head, one voice and one hand, to oppose the common enemy of our Religion? We thank Sir Robert Peel, albeit he designed it not; we thank her Majesty’s Ministers, little as they intended it, for galvanising the dormant Protestant spirit of England; and I must say, that I conceive it will be, under God, upon ourselves, whether we allow that spirit to be lulled to slumber again, either by the treacherous syren song of pretended friends, or by the opiates of open foes. We are told in Parliament, indeed, that our Protestantism is “a negation;” but I think Parliament has already found that it is a stubborn affirmative—a positive reality. It is no “negation” which could bind together hearts and hands as we are bound together at this moment. And we are perfectly resolved in Manchester, the Lord sparing us and enabling us, that the Candidates for our representation shall find, at the next Election, that Protestantism is a great reality. (Cheers.) We have already taken steps to adopt a solemn Resolution, to be signed by all parties,—irrespective of party politics, and party theology,—simply pledging ourselves, that we will vote for no man who does not honestly and *ex animo* declare that he will oppose all concessions to Romanism. (Cheers.) My Christian friends, it is delightful and refreshing to our hearts, to find that there is something dearer to us than even corn laws—something dearer to us than even free trade—something dearer to us than our respective theological parties and watch-words—something dearer to us than family, or fortune, or fame, or, we trust, than even life; and it is THE PROFESSION OF THE PURE GOSPEL, as our martyred forefathers have handed it down to us. I rejoice to say, that, in our great metropolis of manufacture, the spirit is rising rapidly. You must make allowance for it, if it has risen rather slowly. We were the first to meet; the first petition was from the Churchmen of Manchester, signed by 19,000 good honest men. Our Dissenting brethren also immediately entered

the field ; our Wesleyan brethren did nobly—our Dissenting brethren no less nobly. If we do not fight exactly in the same *corps*, we fight in the same army ; and the same banner waves over our different bands, and shows that the host is one ; and upon the one side of that banner we see inscribed, “The Gospel of Christ, and Christ alone ;” and on the opposite side, “No peace with Antichrist.” (Cheers.) Thank God, we have now a common, holy, righteous cry, with which to rally the host of Christ’s faithful soldiers, who have each too long had his own separate watchword ; we have now one common watchword—*our common Protestantism*. (Cheers.) And I thank God, my Christian friends, that it is so, even among our rich manufacturers. Those who have been so much in love with Sir Robert Peel because of his admirable commercial policy, which we all admit, and because of his monetary measures, (and Mammon, I am sorry to say, has a large party in Manchester as well as in London,) it is remarkable that, although many have said, “Sir Robert Peel has done well ; he is the man to be at the head of affairs ; where is the master mind to take his place?”—yet I have never found one man who has dared to look the religious question in the face. They none of them like to look at the matter in that light. They admit that Sir Robert Peel has betrayed his principles ; but then, they say, it is necessary to have the man. Better, I say, better have the feeblest head with the principled heart, than the mightiest mind with the unprincipled heart. (Great cheering.) I speak not now of private character—God forbid ! I respect and revere Sir Robert Peel as a private man ; I believe he is a good father, husband, master, landlord : but I say his public conduct is unprincipled. (Loud cheers, the whole assembly rising to applaud.) That, Sir, is the feeling in Manchester ; I defy any Manchester man present to get up and deny that the feeling in that town is, that the conduct of Sir Robert Peel on this measure has been unprincipled. He has betrayed the very persons who placed him in power ; and now he turns round and says, “You were fools to let yourselves be betrayed and beguiled.” Sir, we thank God that we are “fools ;” for we hope never to lack the charity that will trust a man till it can trust him no longer. (Cheers.) We have, further, a memorial to our beloved and revered Sovereign in course of signature, which I think will be sent up with at least 20,000 or 30,000 names,—entreating her to dissolve Parliament, and gauge the Protestant feeling of her loyal subjects, before she puts her hand to a Bill which will virtually destroy the right of the House of Brunswick to the Throne of England, (hear, hear,) and virtually open the door to the House of Stuart,—if it has a representative yet in existence. We are told that this is the language of agitation, and that it is presumptuous language ; but who has exposed the foundations of the Throne ? who has called attention to the fact, that our beloved Queen sits on that Throne, and holds that Sceptre,—(and long may she hold it, and sit there ! and long may she merit and deserve it !)—by holding it on the tenure of an uncompromising and unchanged Protestantism ? (Cheers.) I rejoice further to say, that in Manchester, at a recent meeting, no fewer than forty of the clergy of the town were present ; that of those forty, there was a majority of the incumbents ; (and numbers more would have been present, but for prior and pressing engagements ;) that the spirit in Manchester is rising higher and

higher ; and that we trust in God, the cry will go forth to the whole world, from the Protestant population in this Country—"No surrender ! no compromise ! no perfidy !"—and, in spite of the sneers of Parliament, and the scorn of modern philosophy, we will add to the watch-cry, "No Popery in England !" (Loud cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. HALLEY.—Sir, I do not know that since I have been at Manchester or since I have been a Congregational minister, I have ever before regretted it ; but I do feel some hesitation at finding myself the first of that denomination who will address this meeting. I hardly know whether I am here as a representative from Manchester ; certainly I am not a representative of Manchester ; but I hardly know whether I am a representative of the Congregationalists of Manchester, for I believe it is usual for him who assumes the character of a representative to have assented to his election. Now, Sir, I left Manchester last Monday, protesting against being elected to appear in this Conference, and stating most decidedly the grounds upon which I felt indisposed to attend. But, being about fifty miles on the road, on other important engagements yesterday, I was very much surprised, and somewhat alarmed, (for, being a family man, I thought of my wife and children at home,) to see two of the County Magistrates of Manchester come to the house, and request me to accompany them. I went to the railroad at eleven o'clock that night, and I have been travelling from the Staffordshire potteries during the whole of the night ; sixteen hours ago I had not the least expectation of being sent up to the Conference. Therefore I hardly know whether I am clothed with the character of a representative. I speak with regard to no opinions but my own ; no one else is responsible for anything which I say. From the enquiry which I have made, I find that I am sent here quite unshackled and untrammelled ; but I must be understood distinctly to say, that I come here for no other purpose whatsoever than to pledge myself to simple opposition to the Maynooth Grant. I do not pledge myself to any ulterior measure ; I do not pledge myself to seek the repeal of this Act, if it should once be passed. I did, Sir, feel very scrupulously that, if there had been a compact, on the Union with Ireland, in respect to Maynooth, I hardly knew how I should act ; but no compact, I am sure, has been made out. If there be a compact, was it for £8000, or was it for £26,300, or what is the extent to which it proceeds ? That is a question which it is necessary to have settled. Let us know how, if a Prime Minister two or three years hence should say to us, "You are bound by your compact to give £200,000 a-year," any one can tell us what is meant by "the spirit of the compact," if there is no literal compact to judge by ? I say, I pledge myself to no ulterior measures. If this measure be carried, there will be a compact ; we shall all be bound by it ; it will be sanctioned by the constitutional authorities of the kingdom ; I say, it will be a compact, ("No, no,") and I am not the man to violate national compacts. It will be a compact on the part of those who make it—the authorities of this kingdom—which none of us will deny. ("No, no.") I stand here to speak my own opinions, not those of any one else. I am sure that it cannot be repealed without full compensation to all the parties concerned, whom this nation may engage to pay so much a-year, for certain purposes, so long as they fulfil them. But, Sir,



this view, in my opinion, renders the thing far more solemn, far more impressive. If I thought that the Bill might be repealed next year,—whatever others may think,—I should not feel as I do upon this momentous, this all-important question. It seems to me the concession of the whole principle—(hear, hear)—it seems to me a great and momentous step, which, if it can by any means be prevented, must be so by a union of all religious parties who oppose it; not by a compromise of principle—(I am not the man to advise a compromise of principle)—(hear, hear)—but by a careful observance of a compact not to wound the feelings of each other; nor to be ready to take offence if we hear anything not exactly in accordance with our own views. It was my pleasure to attend a meeting in Manchester—I do not know that I had any right to be there, but a platform ticket was given to me—(hear, hear, from the Rev. Hugh Stowell)—which was held by members of the Established Church in that town; and certainly, for the most part, I did coincide, with all my heart, in the statements so eloquently made—made with that feeling and honesty, which I am sure belong to him—by the gentleman from that town whom you have heard this morning. As to the state of things in Manchester, I know not whether I am entitled to speak at all; if I am, I am not competent to say much. There are certain friends of the measure in that town. We have unfortunately against us, to a great extent, the fourth estate of the realm. (Hear, hear.) We have certainly a large proportion of the newspaper press decidedly opposed to us. There is also a Petition in the course of signature, which has, I am told, been signed by very respectable men of all parties, in favour of the Grant. But of one thing I am certain, that these men, be they who they may, have no principle to stand upon in supporting this measure. (Hear, hear.) I do not think they profess to have any principle. They merely say, “Well, all parties must now agree; for the Country is in such a state that it is necessary to do so.” The greater part are lovers of peace, who think that we ought to do everything for quietness, and, therefore, that we should let this measure be carried as quickly as possible. There are others who would, I believe, sacrifice every thing to party feelings; and, because the leaders of the two great political parties support the measure, they also support it. And, Sir, there is an argument, to which I will advert in the language of Sir Robert Peel, which may have had some effect. “Whatever you do,” says he, “with us Ministers—punish us as you please, do what you please with us—but whatever you do with us, oh carry the measure; if you wish for peace in Ireland, carry the measure; if you wish to preserve inviolate the Union between the two Countries, carry the measure; if you would not have a rebellion, carry the measure.” I think I shall be sustained by the meeting in saying, that no Prime Minister of this or any other Country has a right to bring a measure before the Representatives of the people, and then, without due consideration, to say to them, “If you do not pass this measure, the consequence will be little else than rebellion.” (Hear, hear.) If that be our position, who, I ask, has placed us in it? (Hear, hear.) If that be the perilous condition of our Country at this moment, who is the author of the peril? (Hear, hear.) If we are on the brink of a rebellion, provided this Bill be not carried, who brought the Bill into the House of Commons? Who has done the mischief? (Hear, hear.)

I think, Sir, that it is unconstitutional for any Minister to endeavour to absolve himself from responsibility by saying, "You must carry this measure, or the Union is dissolved—the Constitution is overturned—and no one can tell how frightful may be the consequences." Let not a British Minister bring forward measures before the Representatives of the people, unless he is prepared for the rejection of those measures in the event of their being disapproved. (Hear, hear.) I know it may be asked, what business have I, or any of us, to interfere in this matter? Sir, such a question has been asked. Mr. Sheil asked, "What business have the sectarian Anabaptists, the fierce Independents, and the ignorant Methodists, to interfere in the present dispute?" (Hear, hear.) Now, let me ask, in reply, Why, if Mr. Sheil thinks that the sectarian Anabaptists, the fierce Independents, and the ignorant Methodists, have no right to intermeddle with this question, why is he allowed the right of discussion in that House, which represents sectarian Anabaptists, fierce Independents, and ignorant Methodists? (Hear, hear.) Will the friends of this measure in Parliament take up the language of Mr. Sheil, and say at the next Election, "This was a measure with which you sectarian Anabaptists, fierce Independents, and ignorant Methodists had nothing to do?" (Laughter.) Will they say, at the next general Election, "Oh, on that occasion you interfered where you had no business to interfere; and therefore we cannot, of course, solicit your votes"? I believe that, on that occasion, the friends of this measure will be thankful for any votes they can get from any party whatsoever, be they the poorest and vilest that creep upon the face of the earth; be they the fierce Republicans that dwell in the manufacturing districts, or be they the most ignorant of Religionists; though, I believe, they consider us *all* very ignorant on this and on other subjects. I said, that I pledge myself simply to opposition to this measure; I must now repeat, that I cannot bind myself to anything else. I must say, most distinctly, that I do not know what there may be in the future. I did feel most strongly in the last Session of Parliament, in reference to a question to which I scarcely like to advert, lest I should be touching some feelings scarcely in harmony with my own,—I did feel that the Chapels' Bill was a most unjust and injurious measure. Perhaps this meeting has no concern with the matter to which I allude: I merely refer to it on account of my own position. If ever I felt that I could not vote for any one again, it would be in reference to a man who had voted strenuously for that measure; and I have no hesitation in saying, that I refer to the honourable Member for Macclesfield. He has throughout, however, voted against this proposal in reference to Maynooth,—being one of the few liberal Members who have done so; and, if it had happened that I had voted against him, I hardly know how I should have felt under such circumstances. I would not for a moment indulge in the language of agitation; and, though some may differ from me, I shall on this occasion call certain parties Catholics and not Papists, because I hold that every religious sect has a right to call itself by whatever name it may please. (Cries of "No, no.") Let me say, however, that, although in some language we may not all exactly harmonise, and although in some sentiments we may not all concur, yet on the one great point—the only point before us—of opposition to this measure, our feelings are distinct, and our union is decided. (Cheers.) I am happy to say, that, in

the neighbourhood of Manchester, all the efforts which could be used have been employed against this measure. Some persons have even said, in allusion to our exertions to influence the Members, "You want to make people vote against their consciences." I believe that persons possessing the greatest influence in that district, have visited them within the last fortnight. I believe the gentleman who proposed one of them on the hustings, at the last Election for Manchester, has urged the matter on their attention; and I know, also, that a gentleman of great influence, both with him and in the neighbourhood, has visited the Member for Salford. For what reason I know not, but, in the last division, the Member for Salford voted against the Bill; that is to say, he voted for Mr. Law's Amendment, that the Report should be brought up that day six months. (Hear, hear.) I have endeavoured to prevent any misunderstanding as to my own position. Feeling, as I do, very deeply on this question, I pledge myself only to act with others in the one point of opposition to this Bill, until it receives the Royal signature. If, unfortunately, the Royal arms of Britain should once be emblazoned on the title of this Bill, it may be for us to consider what we will do; but I think we are not prepared to pledge ourselves at present.

The CHAIRMAN. — Gentlemen, on account of peculiar local circumstances, you will permit me to propose, that a third speaker should be heard from Manchester; and I know you will feel gratified when I state, that that third speaker will be the Rev. Dr. Massie.

The Rev. Dr. MASSIE, Independent minister from Manchester.—I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will allow one of the Wesleyan brethren from Manchester to address the Conference. I believe there are not fewer than between eighty and ninety Deputies from that town. (Hear.) Now—holding the position which, through the kindness and importunity of my friends, I have been called to occupy in Manchester, as the Secretary of the Anti-Maynooth movement in connexion with the Independents—I am in some degree acquainted with what has there taken place in reference to this question. I am happy to say, that the constituency of Manchester have been most assiduous in their communications with the Members for the Town; and I believe that whilst one of them, on account of indisposition, has not been present in the House during the whole discussion, and therefore has not voted,—I mean Mr. Mark Phillips,—the other Member, who voted for the measure in its last two stages, did so under the apprehension, that there might be modifications introduced, which would be satisfactory to his constituents, afterwards; and I believe further, that it remains with his constituents to tell him what is to be the course pursued by him hereafter. (Cheers.) I am happy also to state, that—although the Member for Salford did at first vote for the measure, because he viewed it as an educational scheme—having been kind enough to enter into a correspondence with his friends on the subject, he was led to see, that it was but the beginning of the Endowment of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland, in England, and in Scotland; (hear, hear,) and therefore,—although he voted for it at first, as a measure of education,—he is now pledged to vote against it, and I believe it will receive his opposition in every future stage. (Cheers.) May I be allowed to state, that there are amongst the deputation present three aldermen of Manchester. (Hear, hear.) I

make this statement, because it has appeared in the public prints, that a petition has proceeded from Manchester in support of the measure, signed by the mayor of Manchester, and other members of the Corporation. This has been represented in the public prints, as a Corporation proceeding. But I am warranted in saying, that there was no Corporation meeting; that this is no Corporation measure; and that it is a misrepresentation of the petition, to represent it as the petition of the Corporation of Manchester. (Hear, hear.) In reference to the constituents of Manchester and the immediate neighbourhood, I am authorised to state, that the Free Trade party have well plied—I use the word significantly—well plied the Representatives in Parliament connected with that party, to be consistent with their principles, and to oppose this measure. (Laughter.) I do not wish to occupy the time of the Conference; but I cannot avoid saying, that I have been delighted with what has fallen from Mr. Stowell. We may be said to be ecclesiastical antipodes. (Laughter.) But I bless God, that I believe we are children of the same Father, and shall be heirs of the same inheritance. (Cheers.) I perfectly concur with Dr. Halley, that the opposition to this Bill is decided against the Endowment of Maynooth,—against the nationalising of Popery. But I ought to rectify a mistake into which he has fallen, by stating that the fourth estate of the realm is entirely against us in Manchester. Sir, there is not a more consistent, a more strenuous, or a more able opponent of the Maynooth Bill, than *The Manchester Times*; there is not a more ardent and zealous antagonist of the principle of that Bill than *The Manchester Courier*. Both these papers advocate our cause. There is a paper in Manchester, which has no principles, (hear, hear) which waits till it sees how the wind blows, and trims its sails according to the current. When it sees on which side the parliamentary majority will be found, that is the side which it takes. (Laughter.)

The CHAIRMAN. — Will you allow me to suggest the importance of keeping, as far as possible, to local information? There will be a meeting held to-morrow for the discussion of principles. (Hear.)

The Rev. G. OSBORN, Wesleyan Minister, from Manchester.—It must be apparent to you, Sir, from what has already been stated, that the opponents of this measure in Manchester have adopted the course of giving to it, what may be called sectional opposition; and the gentlemen from that Town, by whom I have been preceded, have confined themselves, mainly at least, to narrating the action of the several sections of the Christian Church to which they belong. With respect to the Methodists, allow me to say, that the feeling attributed to that body in Manchester has been most truly and correctly described. There is a feeling of strong, and I may say, intense disgust at the measure for endowing Maynooth; and that feeling is shared alike by those who, in time past, have been the political opponents and those who have been the political supporters of Sir Robert Peel. (Hear, hear.) Nothing, in fact, has given me greater delight, in observing the progress of this movement, than to have been compelled to come to the conclusion, that party politics have been entirely overpowered by the strong sense of religious duty, urging all religious parties to oppose, by every legal and constitutional means, this iniquitous measure. The meetings of Methodists which have been held on this subject have been most numerous attended; and they

have been inspired by a feeling amounting to enthusiasm. Meetings have been held, not merely in Manchester, but in Stockport, Oldham, Bury, and most of the large towns by which Manchester is surrounded. Deputations from several of these places are present this day. Differing as we do from many gentlemen in this room,—to whom I shall not more particularly allude,—on many points which might be urged in discussing this question,—we are all, I trust, most ardent and unanimous in reprobating the proposal to endow the college of Maynooth, and firmly determined, as I have said, by every means in our power, to prevent that measure from passing into a law. We shall not be contented with petitions for the repeal of the Act, in case the Bill should pass; though we can scarcely bring ourselves to believe that it will do so. We have a strong conviction, that if the Sovereign of this realm were appealed to, as She should be appealed to, to dissolve Parliament, and take the sense of the nation on this question, that appeal would not be made in vain. (Cheers.) We do hold, that it is not a constitutional thing for a Minister of the British Crown, to enter avowedly upon a new line of state policy, involving the most important interests in the United Kingdom, in opposition to the feelings of large portions of the constituency of the kingdom, and to refuse them the opportunity of expressing their sentiments on a question of such vast importance, and which excites so strong and intense an interest. (Cheers.) We have forwarded petitions to the House of Commons; and it is also within my knowledge, that the Wesleyan constituents generally have communicated freely with their Representatives; and I have some reason to believe that in one instance those communications have not been made in vain. I feel satisfied that if the present holy agitation be maintained, and if the blessing of God shall rest, as I humbly trust it may, upon the united counsels and efforts of this great gathering of our fellow-Christians and fellow-subjects, we may yet succeed in averting from our Country the dire evil of endowing the College of Maynooth. I have only to add, as a further illustration of the extent to which religious convictions and a sense of duty have prevailed over party attachments in my own neighbourhood, that at the first meeting held on this subject in Manchester, which was no less densely crowded than the present, two of the speakers who expressed a decided opinion against the measure, and a willingness to risk everything that belonged to their party rather than be instrumental in any degree to its success, were gentlemen who had each contested a borough in the Conservative interest in time past; while another gentleman who opposed one of the Conservative candidates at the last election,—and who would have been here to-day to speak for himself, if he had not been prevented by an engagement which was quite beyond his control,—stated, that he, for one, was prepared to throw party overboard, to throw free trade overboard,—if necessary, to throw everything overboard, but his religion,—in opposing this measure. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—I beg now to introduce to the meeting a gentleman who long represented the town of Leeds in Parliament,—Edward Baines, Esq.

E. BAINES, Esq., sen., of Leeds, formerly Member of Parliament for that town, on being called upon to address the meeting, said,—I was exceedingly gratified, Sir Culling, at the luminous view which you gave of the course of

proceedings, which should be adopted, as far as possible, in order to effect the great object we have in view. I will not occupy your attention for more than a few moments, and will endeavour to carry out, as far as lies in my power, one suggestion especially which you made,—namely, that each representative who should be appointed to speak, should confine himself, as nearly as may be, to local information connected with the place which he represents. It was my pleasure to preside at a meeting in Leeds, so large that it was restrained by nothing but the dimensions of the building in which it was held; and this meeting took place, I am happy to say, before that influence which is stated by Sir Robert Peel to have put this mighty machine in motion, could possibly reach Leeds. (Hear, hear.) On that occasion, although, as I have stated, the place in which we were assembled was filled almost to suffocation, we did not find opposed to our object more than half-a-dozen individuals. This, be it observed, was a meeting called without any restraint. Every person was allowed to come to that meeting who thought proper to do so; and yet greater unanimity was manifested than I had ever before witnessed in the whole of my experience. (Hear, hear.) We did not indeed adopt the extremely unwise part of endeavouring to find topics for division. We endeavoured, on the contrary, to discover topics of union; and therefore we became an united and consolidated body. I am quite sure, from what I see of the complexion of this meeting, and of the tone which has prevailed in it, that that example will be followed on the present occasion. There emanated from that meeting a petition, praying that this measure might not pass into a law. I believe it went so far as to pray, that the former grant might not be continued: at all events, it prayed that it might by no means be increased. (Hear, hear.) To that petition, out of a male adult population, perhaps not exceeding from 20,000 to 25,000 persons, we have had signatures to the amount of 16,000. (Hear, hear.) There is one point which I cannot omit to mention, and that is, that Sir Robert Peel seems to me quite to have mistaken the nature of this agitation. Sir Robert Peel says, “he ought not to pay much deference to the opposition to this measure.” Why? Because it has been put in action, he says, not by the people who are interested in it, but by some remote operation which originated in London. Is that the case? (Cries of “No.”) Does not Sir Robert Peel, upon every occasion when this measure is discussed, find his friends on both sides of the House—(laughter) (formerly he had friends only on one side of the House,)—getting up and saying, “I will vote in favour of the grant to Maynooth, although I know that such conduct is contrary to the declared opinion of the people?” Now, if that be true, how can it be, that this great movement is put in operation by any external cause? Let it be observed, not one man, in the whole course of these discussions, has got up in the House of Commons and said,—“I vote *against* this measure, although I know that I shall thus be acting contrary to the opinion of my constituents.” (Hear.) They all know, in fact, that the measure which is proposed has met with the opposition of nearly the whole of their constituents. They all know, that any attempt to represent their constituents as being in favour of it would be a dereliction of truth; and therefore, I repeat, not a single Member in the House has made any such statement. Having said thus much, permit me to add one

observation, namely, that there is in the West Riding of the County of York, containing a population of 1,200,000 persons, a vast number of towns acting upon the principle which we have met this day to recognise; that I have no doubt their support will be given to the proceedings of this meeting; and that, as far as their influence extends, or is likely to have any effect upon Parliament, it will be exerted for the attainment of your object. (Cheers.)

The Rev. R. NEWSTEAD, of Leeds, Wesleyan Minister.—Sir, I feel exceedingly honoured in being allowed to address this meeting; but I will only occupy its attention for a moment, in reference to one of your last recommendations to the meeting, concerning the solemn duty of importunate prayer to Almighty God for his divine blessing upon our proceedings. I have seen many great meetings, but I have never seen one like the present; and it has been delightful to my mind, during its progress, to witness what I consider an evident answer to prayer. It so happens, that those upon whose authority I stand here to-day,—that is to say, one of the largest congregations in Leeds,—came to a determination, at the same time that they resolved to send myself and my colleague to represent them, that they would join in solemn prayer to God, at the very hour when they supposed we should have met together as a Conference; and I believe that, from twelve o'clock this day until one, they will have been occupied in the performance of that engagement. Sir, we have a right to believe, from the promises of the word of God, that prayer offered by such hearts as we believe there are in this assembly, will not be disregarded in the Court of Heaven, through the intercession of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the first meeting\* to which I have referred, the feeling manifested by the members of the congregation was delightful to witness. I never beheld, in fact, so intense a feeling on any given point. When, before I left that town, we bent our knees together, to implore the Divine blessing on these proceedings, it seemed as if the speaker offering up supplication could scarcely proceed or be heard, for the loud responses of those around him. This is to my mind exceedingly cheering, under the circumstances in which we are placed by the sayings and doings of a certain House in this Country. I cannot reflect, without feelings which I almost fear to express, lest I should appear to be wanting in respect to an august assembly, upon certain insulting words uttered in that House. I did feel surprised—and something I will not name else—at finding our Protestantism, at this time of day—in the year 1845—called a “negative idea.” (Hear, hear.) I read these words with astonishment! But I hope, by this time, the thing has been sufficiently defined for the instruction of the Right Hon. Gentleman by whom that expression was used. I read in the paper, which reported, up to last Wednesday, the number of Petitions which had been laid on the table of the House on this momentous occasion—I think it amounted to upwards of 6,000; and I believe the signatures attached to these Petitions amounted to 766,450. Sir, these are definitions of Protestantism. (Hear, hear.) It is not an undefined idea with the persons who have signed those Petitions. They have arrived at years of intelligence; and I think that neither in Luther’s, nor in the noble sayings of that revered Protestant monarch

\* The meeting by which the Deputation was appointed.—EDITOR.

George III., shall we find more distinct definitions. (Cheers.) Sir, I look with trembling anxiety to the issue of these proceedings ; and I do think, that every one of us will be able to look back upon them with more satisfaction, if we lift up our minds in prayer to the Throne of Heaven. We may, however, also be permitted to appeal to the throne of our beloved and revered Monarch ; and I earnestly trust, that Her heart will be found to respond to the sentiment of that prayer which has so often been presented for her, that she may “ever have affiance in God, and ever seek his honour and glory.” (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN then called the name of the Rev. F. Close, vicar of Cheltenham ; but it was stated that he was not present, although there was every reason to believe that he would be.

The Rev. Dr. KEITH, from Aberdeen, expressed on behalf of those whom he represented, his entire concurrence in the proceedings of the Conference.

The Rev. Dr. GREVILLE made a similar statement, with reference to the Episcopal body.

The Rev. Dr. BROWN.—I have the honour to represent in this large assembly, in conjunction with my respected colleagues, the office-bearers of seventeen congregations of the Free Church of Aberdeen. From the shortness of the notice which we received, it was impossible to assemble together the members of those congregations : but we convened the Elders and the Deacons ; and, as far as that was possible, it was *by them* that this Deputation was appointed. Our Dissenting friends in general are, I believe, equally opposed to this measure, though upon principles perhaps somewhat different from our own. With respect to the Free Church of Aberdeen, which is a very large and numerous body,—and, I believe, our friends of the Dissenting denominations will tell you the same thing with respect to the bodies they represent,—there is but one unanimous feeling, namely, that this measure is most pernicious, as affixing a national sanction to Popery, as taking it into connexion with the State, and likewise legalising, and setting up, in fact, another Establishment. Not being brought into constant contact with them, I cannot speak from exact information as to the members of the Established Church in the city of Aberdeen ; but I must presume that they are opposed to it, because the Synod, the principal ecclesiastical court of that district, has unanimously passed a petition against this measure ; and I feel perfectly satisfied, that the strongest feeling prevails amongst the bodies who are represented here, that it is our duty, sinking party differences, and throwing aside all reference to opposite views which we may entertain on certain topics, and looking to our common Protestantism and common Christianity,—not only to lift up our solemn protest against the measure, and to use every means in our power to prevent it from passing ; but also to do everything else which duty may require of us, unanimously to continue that protest and that opposition : I believe this will be found to be the feeling. I speak under correction if I am mistaken. I shall not further detain the Conference, except to express the delight which I feel at seeing the unanimity by which its proceedings are marked ; and that, whilst each conscientiously adheres to the particular views which he entertains, and makes no compromise of them, he is equally resolved to make no compromise of those great principles upon which we found a



determined opposition to this most pernicious, and let me add, this most faithless measure introduced into Parliament by the Government. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. SIMPSON, of Aberdeen.—We have had, in Aberdeen, the most enthusiastic meetings in reference to this great subject. At one of the meetings we were obliged to adjourn, for the purpose of allowing a further opportunity for the expression of public opinion. At the second meeting which was held, an immense number of persons attended. The Synod of Aberdeen have also done themselves the honour of taking part in the great struggle in which we are engaged. I confess I never saw petitions signed with more cordiality and earnestness in the whole course of my life. I rejoice in having this opportunity of coming forward publicly, to protest against the whole system of Popery. I hope we shall show distinctly, by our petitions and proceedings, that the Prime Minister cannot set the country at defiance in reference to this question. And whilst speaking of him, I cannot but say, that I think he has offered a very great insult to our common Protestantism, by refusing to receive a Deputation from such an Assembly as ours.

The CHAIRMAN.—The name of Leamington will, I am sure, bring up the names of gentlemen whom you would all be delighted to hear. There is one revered friend, connected with that place, who will be listened to with peculiar pleasure. I refer to the Rev. Dr. Marsh.

The Rev. Dr. MARSH, of Leamington, then rose and said,—Sir Culling, I have been accustomed to attend public meetings for about half a century, but I have never attended a more extraordinary meeting than the present. I look around me and I cannot see a single churchman, I look around me and I cannot see a single dissenter; but I see a tessellated pavement of true honest Protestant heads, under which, I am persuaded, there are true, honest, Protestant hearts. (Cheers.) Sir, I am a Briton, and therefore I love civil liberty. (Cheers.) I profess to be a Christian, and therefore I love religious liberty. (Continued cheering.) I say as a British Christian it is my duty to do everything in my power to preserve a Constitution which has been upheld for centuries on the principles of civil and religious liberty. Sir, I have noticed that we have none here but Protestant heads and Protestant hearts; and I want none else to plead the cause before us. It will be out of my power to attend your further meetings, as I must retire from the Metropolis this afternoon. May I, then, be allowed to ask a question, which is intimately connected with the principle of our opposition to this Bill? The question which I ask is, What is Protestantism? If I understand it aright, it is, that our Lord Jesus Christ is the Prophet, the Priest, and the King of His Church, and that there is none other. If I understand it aright, it is this, that the inspired writings, called the Holy Scriptures, which are the oracles of God, are indeed inspired; and that there is none other writing that calls itself inspired, which has any right to such a title. I will notice, also, in asking, What is Protestantism? that every man, as a rational being, is bound to obtain the best information he can with reference to his spiritual and his eternal interests; and, having obtained the best information he can, his conscience is answerable to God and to no other being in the universe. (Cheers.) With reference to the place from which I come, I will just say, that there was the largest meeting on this subject that I ever saw in that town,—so large, that a very

large room could not contain all who would have been within those doors ;— and that that meeting was perfectly unanimous with respect to the object which you have in view. Sir, a few words more, which appear to me to be connected with the present subject. Do we want, as a Protestant Catholic (hear, hear, and cheers) Church, visibility? I look at the meeting before me, representing the Protestant feeling, and we have visibility in our assembly. Do we want antiquity? We have the Patriarchs, for they were Protestants. We have the Prophets, for they were Protestants. We have the Apostles, for they also were Protestants. They were men raised up in our world, to enter their protest against all error injurious to the spiritual and eternal interests of men. They were men who would rather sacrifice their lives than sacrifice their principles. (Cheers.) Do we want visibility? Do we want antiquity? We have both in the Protestant Catholic Church. And let me add, that all we want in addition is, that to which so proper an allusion has been made by several of our Christian brethren, namely, prayer to Him who raised up the Patriarchs, the Prophets, and the Apostles. And I do hope, that we shall all be found in succession to them. (Cheers.) Having made these few remarks, and having been a Protestant operative for about half a century, I beg to observe that, supposing that ladies as well as gentlemen would be permitted to attend this meeting, I applied to the Committee for a ticket for my daughter who is with me in Town. That request would have been granted: but when I found that ladies were not to attend on the present occasion, I declined the kindness which was offered. I have, Sir, but one son: but if I had two sons, I would swear them both on this altar, to defend the Protestant cause, to speak peace to Rome, by sending the Scriptures to Rome; (cheers) but to have no peace *with* Rome, so long as those Scriptures shall be kept back from the people. (Cheers.)

The Rev. ALFRED POPE, Independent Minister, of Leamington, on being called upon to address the meeting, said—I shall do no more than simply confirm the statement which Dr. Marsh has made, respecting the cordiality and unanimity of all denominations of Christians in the town of Leamington, in opposing the Maynooth Grant; and I am charged by the parties whom I represent, to state, that they hope, that, if the Maynooth Bill should be carried, there will afterwards be an earnest endeavour to secure its repeal.

The CHAIRMAN.—I have hitherto been guided entirely by regard to places, but there are cases in which names will occur, connected with different parts of the Country, which may require a deviation from that rule. I am quite sure that, when I mention Watton, and the name of our friend the Rev. E. Bickersteth, you will all feel that we are justified in a deviation from our order of proceeding.

The Rev. E. BICKERSTETH then came forward, and said,—I bless God, Sir Culling, for what my eyes see this day,—those who “love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity” uniting together in defence of the great principles of our Protestant faith. (Hear, hear.) Thanks be to God, that the enemy, who little thought of this when he planned the Endowment of Popery among us,—who little thought of anything but the success of the apostasy,—has thus brought together all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity—all those who hold the grand Protestant doctrine of salvation “by grace through

faith unto holiness, not of works, lest any man should boast,"—all who hold the great doctrine of the Triune Jehovah—the Father who made us, the Son who redeemed us, and the Holy Spirit who sanctifies us, and that we are thus made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. The enemy little thought, that these blessed doctrines of the Gospel would now be seen to be the great things which unite Christians together, and which, by the blessing of God, they will maintain, cost what it may. (Cheers.) I have been deeply pained, in reading the debates in the House of Commons, to see how little there is of true Christian principle *there*. I have been deeply pained to see, that the Prime Minister of this great Protestant Country should dare to call the instructions of Popery "the consolations of religion"—(Hear, hear)—that he should dare to say that the sacrifice of the mass, and extreme unction, and all those things which the Popish priest brings for the delusion of the dying, are really, in his view, "the consolations of religion." God forbid, Christian friends, that we should know so little of the Word of God as that. We deeply feel, that all this is the Mystery of Iniquity. We deeply feel, that it is the Apostasy predicted in the Word of God; that, so far from being "the consolations of religion," it is the device of Satan to destroy the soul. I will not, however, when there are so many surrounding me, who will rejoice to give testimony to these things, detain you longer. I am thankful for the opportunity which has been afforded to me, to express my opinion in connexion with my brethren; and I do heartily give my testimony to the great magnitude and importance of those Protestant principles, which, by the grace of God, cost what it may, we will never sacrifice.

The Rev. CARTER HALL, a Clergyman of Newcastle-on-Tyne, having been requested to address the Meeting, spoke as follows:—I shall not attempt to occupy the time or attention of the Meeting more than a few moments; but, appearing here as the representative of a considerable body of the inhabitants of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, who have already petitioned Parliament against this measure, I think it right to state, that there is, in that Town, as firm, as rooted, and as unanimous an opposition, on constitutional and religious grounds, to the measure against which we have assembled on this occasion, as can be found in any other Town in this great Protestant Empire. Churchmen and Dissenters,—and amongst the latter, I may especially mention that respectable and estimable body, the Wesleyan Methodists,—have joined hand and heart in their opposition to this Bill. They conceive that they are bound by a common and united interest, to take steps against the passing of this measure, which they regard as no less dishonouring to God, than it is inimical to the best interests of the nation.

Mr. RALPH WILSON.—I attend here as the representative of the Wesleyan Methodists of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. I feel exceedingly happy to meet in this room the Rev. Carter Hall, who represents the Church interest in that Town. I will only say, in reference to the immediate object of our meeting, that the opposition to this measure, on the part of the Wesleyan Methodists of the Town from which I am delegated, is most decided and unanimous. I would further state, that, from a letter which I have received from the excellent Superintendent of that Circuit, I learn that the members of

that body are exceedingly anxious to promote an union of all true Protestants in this Country,—in order not only to prevent the success of this particular measure, but of any future attempt of a similar character. (Hear, hear.) I will not trespass further on the attention of the Meeting; but I am enabled to state, and I will do so, in conclusion,—that the Churchmen and Dissenters of the Town had it in contemplation, more than a week ago, to form an Association, with the view of promoting the object to which I have referred.

The Rev. Mr. SCALES.—It has been suggested, Sir, that you should call upon Dr. Raffles in your way to Wales.

A DEPUTY said, he hoped that, in the course they were taking, they would not forget the little village of Birmingham. (Laughter.)

The Rev. Dr. RAFFLES.—I will only detain you for a minute. I have this moment left the pulpit, and I may truly say, that I have come from the pulpit to the press. (Laughter.) But I am willing to be hot-pressed in such a cause as this (renewed laughter); and I am glad that these few moments are allowed me, because I am obliged immediately to return to Liverpool; and I should have been exceedingly sorry to do so, without having first lifted up my voice against the Maynooth Grant. (Hear, hear.) I have been accustomed to regard myself as a Protestant Dissenter, but to-day I am a Protestant (loud cheers); and, as a Protestant, let me offer my hand and my heart to every man in this Assembly;—and, if any such were here, I would say with Dr. Marsh, to every woman also—to every individual in this great Empire, who holds the same views as ourselves in reference to this subject, I say, here is my hand and my heart, in opposition to this enormous evil. Sir, let but the thin edge of the wedge be got in, and it may be driven up to the thickest. Let the first letter in the alphabet be got over, and it is impossible to say that we shall not go down to “Z.” (Hear, hear.) Let us therefore renew our efforts, and commend our cause to God; let us trust in Him who can move human minds, influence human governments, and overrule all things for good. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—The very importance of Birmingham makes me desirous of postponing the hearing of Deputies from that place until the evening; because I do not think that justice can be done to it in a parenthesis. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. JAMES ROBERTS.—I was only desirous of preventing the omission of that place. I perfectly concur in what you have said.

The CHAIRMAN said.—I have heard Deputies from England, Scotland, and Ireland. I confess that I should now like to hear some of our friends from Wales. (Hear.)

The Rev. D. PRYCE STEPHENS, from Newport.—Sir, I hope it will do you no harm to see a Welsh Dissenter. I am exceedingly obliged to you, Sir Culling, for the compliment of putting Wales in parenthetically. (Laughter.) We are very glad, however, to come in, even parenthetically, in such a cause. I stand before this Conference on behalf of the Baptist sectarians, the fierce Independents, and the bigoted Methodists. (Laughter.) We have been over this subject daily, and almost every hour of the day, for the last month; and we have never dreamed that our respective principles prevented us from acting cordially together in this movement. We have explained to

each other, with unambiguous clearness, the grounds of our opposition; and we have come to the unanimous conclusion, that we can, without compromising anything, engage in united action. We do not live so far from London now as we used to do: (laughter)—that is to say, we can come to London in a much shorter time than formerly. When my grandfather was born, persons who were coming from Wales to London were accustomed, if they had anything to leave, to make their wills first. Now we can breakfast in Wales, and take tea comfortably in London. And I am happy to inform you, that we are not quite so ignorant of Parliamentary doings as we are represented to be; and I would have you understand further, that we think we have a right to give clear and unmistakeable expression to our feelings, in regard to our Misrepresentatives. (Cheers.) We have lately made some remarkable discoveries in South Wales; and, amongst them, this, that Maynooth College is to be endowed by men, who have been supported by persons who have described themselves as Protestants *par excellence*. (Hear, hear.) We find nearly all the men who voted, at the last Election, for the party which placed Sir Robert Peel in power, and which he has betrayed as is his wont—we find nearly all these men now opposed to their own Members, and calling upon us, who formerly opposed them, to assist in keeping them out of Parliament at the next Election. We have made another discovery. We have discovered that we have not, especially in the two counties of Merionethshire and Glamorganshire, what we once supposed we had,—a newspaper press in which we can defend our principles: and, when we came to inquire into the cause, we discovered that the newspapers supposed to be principally in the interest of Evangelical Dissent, and of what are called Liberal politics, are edited by Roman Catholics! (Hear.) To our utter surprise we here found that the regular writers in these papers are Catholics. (A voice, “Roman.”) I believe we need not quarrel about words: perhaps they are Jesuits. (Hear, hear.) At all events, on this subject they gag the press. I mention this as a fact, which perhaps we might have discovered before; but really we had not. We have felt amazed at the reasoning which has been resorted to in Parliament, in reference to this question. I read Mr. Macaulay’s speech, with all the interest which a Dissenter would naturally feel in his argument. After demolishing, as he supposed, one argument after another against the Bill, (and he has a peculiar way of demolishing,) he then referred to the arguments grounded on the Voluntary principle; and to this, as a Dissenter, I looked with the greatest interest. Instead, however, of saying a word in reply to that argument, he said—“Admitting the principle to be good, this case is an exception to it.” It is altogether a *lusus naturæ*. “The Voluntary principle cannot be brought against the Maynooth Bill.” It so happened, that I had recently been reading “Pascal’s Provincial Letters;” and I was vastly amazed at a discovery which I made. I said to myself, Why, surely Mr. Macaulay has adopted the Jesuitical doctrine of *the direction of the intention*. (Hear, hear.) I was, I confess, astonished at an English Statesman coolly declaring, that, though a principle were true, it ought not, in a case of this magnitude, to be applied. I reflected, however, that it was quite in character with the occasion. A man who defends a measure, which will inevitably have the effect of extending Jesuitism, ought to defend it by Jesuitical arguments. (Hear, hear.)

Let me say one word, in reference to the feelings of my countrymen on this subject, as far as I am acquainted with them. The venerable Dr. Marsh said he was a Briton ; I may say, "Much more am I." My countrymen are determined, if I know their feelings,—and I think I am intimately acquainted with them,—to do everything which they can consistently, to prevent the passing of this measure : and, if it do pass, they are determined to encumber it with as many difficulties, especially of a moral nature, and to accumulate upon it and hang about its neck so much infamy, that when the political Joseph Surface of the day shall no longer be at the head of public affairs, his successors may be afraid to attempt anything of a similar kind. By carrying the measure, Sir Robert Peel will only have proved, what certain friends of mine ought to have known before, that he is not a man to be trusted. He has betrayed the confidence of every party that ever placed confidence in him.

Mr. ROBERT JONES, from Merthyr Tydvil.—I attend here as a delegate from the Dissenting congregations of Merthyr Tydvil, who unanimously dissent from the proposed Endowment of the College of Maynooth. We consider the measure alarming in itself ; but we look on it as especially alarming, when considered as a sign of the times. Popery has made little progress in Wales. We are too decidedly Protestants ; and it is not to be expected that we will, in any degree, concur in any assistance being given by Law to any invasion of Popery ; and should that assistance be given, and should Popery by it succeed in gaining ascendancy in this land, we will die at the stake rather than yield to it.

The Rev. WILLIAM JONES, of Swansea.—I cordially sympathise with all the sentiments expressed by the friends who have already addressed this Conference. I attend here on behalf of most of the Dissenting congregations of the town of Swansea. We who reside in that town, are in the habit of maintaining our principles without compromise. We continue to do so under all circumstances. Whatever little differences may sometimes take place, they are soon healed, and we come to union again, and meet on the same platform. It is very gratifying to me to perceive, that there is, in this case, to be no compromise of principles. There are different grounds on which we oppose this Bill,—we all see it with our own eyes, and not with the eyes of each other : but we are willing to engage in the same struggle against it. Were I asked to state the feeling of my fellow-townsmen on this subject, I would say, that they are opposed with one heart and one hand to this measure. They consider it an infringement of their general rights, and of the rights of civil and religious liberty. They consider it an encouragement of error ; they consider it a violation of that Protestant principle which has made such multitudes in Wales *Protestant Dissenters*. The Dissenting denominations are opposed to the principle of Endowment ; they look at the operation of that principle as injurious to Christianity. But they consider the present Bill as opposed to a right view of the duties of the Legislature, and even to the stability of the Throne itself. I may say for myself and my colleagues, that, if we represented Wales *in toto*, I believe the general statement which we should have to make, would still be in opposition to the principle of this Bill. It has filled Wales with alarm. There is no part of the kingdom which, according to its population, is so much under the influence of Christianity as

Wales. But, if the principle involved in this Bill prevail, we are persuaded our rights and privileges will be endangered. I hope you will consider these few remarks as expressive of the sentiments generally entertained in the places which I represent, in opposition to this Bill.

Mr. J. FOULKES, of Newtown, in Montgomeryshire.—It is impossible for every gentleman to do justice to the local information which he possesses, in reference to the district from which he comes. I have the honour of representing the Magistrates, Clergy, and all the Dissenting bodies of Montgomeryshire. I have known Wales for nearly fifty years; and never did I see a question take possession of the hearts of the people in the same degree as this. I have the honour to be a County Magistrate, and I take a great interest in whatever concerns my Country. The district in which I live is generally agricultural. A strong impression prevails, that we have suffered greatly from the operation of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill; but, whatever may be the feeling in reference to that subject, when attempts are made to interfere with that which concerns our God and our religion, there is not the least difference of opinion as to the course which should be pursued. I had the pleasure of forwarding a petition to Mr. Cholmondeley, the Member for our Borough, which had the concurrence of every minister, whether Clergyman or Dissenter; I never saw so much union as was exhibited in reference to that petition. I am sure that our people in Wales at least can say, notwithstanding what has fallen from Mr. Gladstone, that there is something definite in the word "Protestantism." They also feel, that there is something definite in Popery; and that it means "opposition to Protestantism." I feel great pleasure in bringing forward the very hearty opinion, which the whole Principality entertains on this subject. I only wish that Sir Robert Peel had made a little inquiry, before he made such a statement as he did in reference to the influence of the London Committee. I can bear my testimony, that the preparation of the petitions had commenced in Wales, long before any such influence was known. I have no doubt that, before the end of this week, 600 petitions to the House of Commons, and 600 to the House of Lords, will have emanated from Wales. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. JOHN RUSSELL, of the town of Neath.—I am requested to represent six denominations in the town and neighbourhood of Neath, including five or six thousand Protestants. I beg to state, that there was a public meeting held last Thursday, in opposition to the Grant to Maynooth; and at least 1000 signatures have been obtained in opposition to the measure in that small neighbourhood. A very strong feeling prevails among the electors, because they have been misrepresented by the Member for the Borough in reference to this subject.

Loud cries were here made for Mr. Mursell, of Leicester.

The Rev. J. BLACKBURN.—Permit me to say, that it is proposed, that in the evening sitting we should resume the hearing of the respective Deputies from the various Towns and Districts; and it is thought desirable, that we should occupy the few remaining minutes, previous to adjournment, in preparing work for the Committee, which they will be enabled to bring up in the evening sitting; otherwise, although you will have spent the whole morning in listening to interesting and impressive

statements, the business of the Conference will not have been forwarded. I shall therefore suggest, that our friend Mr. Mursell should be heard first this evening.

The Rev. Mr. MURSELL.—I have no desire to make a speech.

The CHAIRMAN.—That is a very good reason why we should hear you, and we shall do so with great pleasure.

The Rev. Mr. MURSELL.—Then I beg respectfully to ask the Chairman, whether a letter has been received by him from the Anti-Maynooth Committee at Leicester?

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, allow me to solicit your attention for a very few minutes. I do not know whether Mr. Mursell desires simply, that I should answer that question in the affirmative? or whether he wishes, that anything should be said on the subject at present? The fact is, I have received the letter, to which I suppose he refers; but, understanding that the name of the town of Leicester would be called over this evening, I thought it better not to allude to the subject at all until that period arrived.

Mr. PRICE, from York, gave in a subscription of £10 from the Operatives of that City, towards defraying the expenses connected with the operations of the Central Committee and the Conference. He expressed a hope, that this small beginning would lead to greater results. He stated that a very general feeling of opposition was felt towards this measure in the City of York. A meeting was held on Monday night, from which two petitions had emanated: one of which was to be presented to the House of Commons, and the other to the House of Lords. They embodied the views of those who had been present.

It was then proposed, seconded, and carried, that the Conference should adjourn until six o'clock in the evening of the same day.

The Conference accordingly adjourned until six o'clock.

\* \* Before the Rev. Dr. Marsh left the room (which he was obliged to do before the Conference adjourned) he was requested by the Chairman to engage in prayer; which he did with much solemnity and earnestness, and in a manner which seemed to carry along with him the hearts of all who were present.



## Second Sitting,

WEDNESDAY EVENING, APRIL 30.

---

At six o'clock, the Deputies having re-assembled,

The Rev. Dr. REED.—Gentlemen, the time for commencing business has passed, and, although we may expect to see many more present this evening, it is necessary that the proceedings should begin. It is understood, as one of the preliminary arrangements, that each Meeting should be considered distinct, and have in its hands the appointment of its own Chairman. It remains, therefore, for this Meeting to determine, who shall be Chairman for this sitting.

A DEPUTY in the body of the room.—I beg leave to propose, that Sir Culling E. Smith do take the Chair.

The motion having been seconded, was carried by acclamation.

The Rev. C. PREST opened the meeting with prayer.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—Gentlemen, since the Conference adjourned, it has been proposed that the Rev. Samuel Nicholson, the Rev. Dr. Steane, and T. Pewtress, Esq., should be added to the Conference Committee.

The Rev. S. GREEN, of Walworth.—I beg, Sir, through yourself, to ask this question,—Whether the consent of the three gentlemen, whose names have been mentioned, has been obtained, to act upon, and become part and parcel of, the Conference Committee, preparatory to their names being proposed?

The Rev. Dr. REED.—The name of the Rev. Mr. Nicholson is proposed by consent, and we have every reason to think, that Mr. Pewtress and the Rev. Dr. Steane will be quite willing to act.

The Rev. S. GREEN.—As a friend and brother of the two last-mentioned parties, I beg leave to say, that I believe from my heart, that neither of them would consent to be nominated in this manner, without being previously asked. I know the men well. I know their habits of business. I know what they think in cases of this kind; and, without determining whether they would act on the Committee or not, if requested, I take it upon me to say, that both of them would resist being put on the Committee, without their consent being previously obtained.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—I will dispose of the whole matter ; a single word will do it. I beg to move that those gentlemen be requested to act on the Committee. (Laughter and cheers.)

The Rev. THOMAS SCALES, of Leeds.—I beg leave to say, that several gentlemen of the Baptist denomination, through one gentleman speaking on their behalf, expressed a wish, that two or three persons of that denomination should be placed on the Committee ; stating that such a proposal would be extremely acceptable ; and, with that view, and in the hope of producing a feeling which I trust we are all anxious to cherish (hear, hear), the nomination of those gentlemen, who are now requested to act on the Committee, was brought before the Meeting as the first business of this evening.

The Rev. SAMUEL NICHOLSON, of Plymouth.—I think it due to the Committee, to express at once my entire concurrence in the request which has been made.

On the motion being put from the Chair,

The Rev. S. GREEN.—I wish to ask, that the request may be put to the other gentlemen during the sitting of the Conference ; and that, if they should refuse, the reason may be placed on the table. (Cries of "No, no.")

The CHAIRMAN.—If the Meeting will be so kind as to hear me for a moment, I would suggest, that the proper course would be, to intimate the request which has been made to those gentlemen. Of course their names will not be considered as belonging to the Committee, unless they consent ; but, on the other hand, if they decline, I think we should not enter into any controversy. (Cheers.)

The motion, as amended, was then put from the Chair, and carried.

The CHAIRMAN.—We shall now take the other places, from which we are anxious to hear intelligence. Allow me just to repeat again, the great importance of our having statements from as many places as possible ; and that, therefore, our friends should restrict themselves, as far as they can, to the giving information as to the state of feeling in their own neighbourhoods, and to other matters of that nature,—without entering on the general question. It was understood, before we separated this morning, that the first place from which we should hear information would be Leicester ; and I hope, gentlemen from that place, therefore, will be prepared to make their statements.

The Rev. Mr. MURSELL, of Leicester.—Would it, Sir, meet your sense of propriety, that the letter to which I referred this morning—the letter which was transmitted to you through my hands from Leicester—should be read to this Meeting ? I should like to have that letter submitted to the Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN, (after pausing for a short time) : Gentlemen—

Mr. EVANS.—Will you allow me, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN.—No : I must not be interrupted. I am placed in peculiar circumstances ; and I feel the difficulty of expressing exactly what I ought to express. I have received the letter to which Mr. Mursell has alluded. It is a letter from some of our Christian friends in Leicester, assigning their reasons for not uniting with us in the present movement (Hear, hear.) Under these circumstances, it seems to me that this letter could hardly with propriety be read. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I should wish to give every proper and fair latitude ; but we do not profess to be a

Meeting of the whole Christian Church. We do not assume to be that. If we did, many present, not concurring in all our proceedings, would be justified in giving their reasons for protesting against them; and I would submit to Mr. Mursell, that, when any parties start by saying, that they wish to keep aloof from the Conference, the mode of protesting is *by absenting themselves* (hear, hear), and not by *opening the great question*, which is in fact involved in this letter, and upon which we certainly should not agree.

The Rev. Mr. MURSELL.—I bow, Mr. Chairman, to your decision. I bow with great deference to your opinion as Chairman; but I am sure you will allow me to say, that I very much regret, that the Meeting has felt it to be its duty to dispense with that letter. I assure you, it was dictated and written by the gentlemen who have communicated it, in the kindest possible spirit, after much serious deliberation. The Committee at Leicester, exclusive of the Unitarian body, who do not unite with it, is composed of twenty-five of the most intelligent, pious, and devoted of the Evangelical Dissenters of that town; and I am afraid they will feel as though they had been slighted. (Cries of “No, no.”) I do not wish you to read the letter, Mr. Chairman; I do not wish these gentlemen to hear it, for I am afraid there is something in it which would rather trouble them. (Laughter.) At the same time, I am bound to say, on behalf of those whom I represent, that I very much regret the decision to which you have come, on account of the effect which will be produced on the great body of Dissenters in this-Country. For anything else I care nothing. Therefore, as for the letter, we shall consider that as quite disposed of. And now I stand here, Mr. Chairman, as the representative of a Protestant Dissenting congregation in the town of Leicester, meeting in Harvey Lane. I shall detain the Meeting but two or three minutes. I have personally a very great respect for my Catholic fellow-subjects in Ireland; I would do everything to extend to them their civil rights, and to promote their advantage in every way. (Cries of “No, no” from some parts of the room.) I really think, Gentlemen, that there is no heart in this assembly, whatever noise the tongue may make, but would respond to this sentiment, and wish well to all their fellow-men, be they Catholic or be they Protestant. (Cheers.) Whilst, however, I sympathise with them under their manifold wrongs, I do not like their religion any more than you do. I dissent as strongly, and as broadly, and as deeply, and as determinedly, as any man, from what is called Popery. I very much dislike it, and indeed, if you will allow me to say so, I hate it; and, if I thought that the measure proposed by Sir Robert Peel would have the effect of overthrowing Popery, I would actually almost promote it for that purpose. (Loud cries of “No, no.”) My aversion to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church is as strong as that of any gentleman around me. Still I wish distinctly to state before this Assembly, the ground on which I rest—the sole, or rather the primary, ground—on which I rest my objections.

The Rev. JOHN BLACKBURN.—I rise, Sir, with deference, to submit to my friend, whether we are to go into the grounds on which he objects to the Bill. (Loud cries of “Hear, hear,” and “Order, order.”)

A DEPUTY.—The ground was gone into this morning.

The Rev. JOHN BLACKBURN.—I thought we were assembled to hear

reports of what had been done in the various towns; that our brethren were to tell us, what had been done to help forward the agitation, and not the reasons on which they acted.

The Rev. Mr. MURSELL.—We are not, Mr. Chairman, bound to go into the grounds at all! Really, gentlemen appear to me as if they were under mesmeric influences. (Laughter.) I shall not go into the grounds, but I shall state, that the grounds on which I appear in this Meeting, and on which I object to the Maynooth Grant, are those of objection to all Endowments of Religion under any shape. (Cries of "Chair, chair," "Order, order.")

The CHAIRMAN.—I am sure, Gentlemen, you will give me credit for wishing to act perfectly impartially. (Cheers.) I cannot do less, the call of order being made, than respond to that call, and give my opinion on the matter in question; and it does seem to me, that if Mr. Mursell does not go into that ground, there cannot be anything objectionable in his stating the fact. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. Mr. MURSELL.—I merely wish distinctly to state this, that I may stand fair with my constituents, the great body of Dissenters with whom I act. Having come here, I am anxious not to be misunderstood by those among whom I stand; that I may be able to go home and say, "I differed from gentlemen there, and they from me; but they allowed me most courteously to state my views." (Cheers.) If Sir Robert Peel, Sir, were proposing to endow the Dissenters of this Country, I should object to that just as much as I do to the Maynooth Grant. I should say, "Sir Robert, I have too much respect for my Religion, and too much regard for my principles, for a moment to think of taking money for such a purpose." I shall not go much further; but, if you would only let me make a speech, I would make such a speech! (Laughter.) If you would only let me say a word about the Irish church—but I will not. I will only add, with your permission, that I live in the Country; and that I was told, that when I came to London,—what I did not know accurately until I arrived here—that on coming to this Meeting, I should not enjoy liberty of speech; and therefore I did not intend to be present. Some gentlemen, however, met me this morning, and said, there had been an instruction given by the Committee that any gentleman coming here should be allowed to state the grounds of his objection to the Grant. On that promise alone I appear here. I find, nevertheless, that the atmosphere, if you will allow me to say so, is so very close, the arrangements, with great deference to the Committee, are so very rigid—that having stated my opinions, bidding you "God speed," and aiming at the same object, though on different grounds—I most respectfully retire.

The Rev. Mr. STOVELL, of Prescott-street, London, then rose to address the Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN.—Are you from Leicester?

The Rev. Mr. STOVELL.—No, Sir; but the question which I have to moot is one of order; and one which involves the quietness of our proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN.—Any question relative to order, I must listen to.

The Rev. Mr. STOVELL.—When an invitation was sent to me, I anticipated that restriction in your movements which I at present find, and there-

fore I did not respond to it. But there are several parts of the Country to which your agents have gone forth, and they have promised to friends, in the name of the Committee, the liberty of speaking out all that they felt, and of stating on any grounds their objections to the Maynooth Grant. (Cries of "No, no.") I am liable to correction; but I submit to you, Sir, and to this Meeting, a fact which is of immense moment. Allow me to say further, that several individuals have come up to town, and some of them, who had been appointed Delegates to this Meeting, had intended to address it to-night, on this specific ground. Now, Sir Culling, I appeal to yourself—and I have known you to be very kind and very impartial—I appeal to yourself, whether there ought not to be provided some friendly, kindly, and convenient method of hearing the objections or dissent of those individuals. Seeing that they have been brought here with such an expectation, their protest should, in some proper way, be laid before the Conference. (Cries of "No, no.") I submit that we should know, in what way such individuals may acquit themselves conscientiously. (A voice, "Go home.")

The CHAIRMAN.—This Meeting has been convened by a circular, dated the 19th of April; and, although gentlemen have travelled through several parts of the Country, in connexion with the Anti-Maynooth Committee, in each instance that circular has been placed in their hands, and they were told that their statements to gentlemen in the Country, should be in the spirit of that circular. Now the circular contained these sentences:—"Be it ours to form a counter-alliance, based upon the primary doctrines of the Reformation, and upon a mutual forbearance with regard to minor differences." (Hear, hear, and laughter.) Then in the close of the address, it is said, "Be it ours, then, in the spirit of charity towards our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, to unite together with a generous and honourable respect for one another's opinions, political and ecclesiastical; and, by one great and holy confederation, to defeat this iniquitous measure, and so to uphold the honour of our Country, and the pure religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." It certainly seems to me that, under these circumstances, it will not be right for any Churchman to say here anything that might be painful to a brother Dissenter; and that, on the other hand, it will not be right for a Dissenter to say anything, or enter into any argument, that would give pain to Churchmen. Any discussion on the general question—on the subject of Church Establishments—would not, as it seems to me, be appropriate in this Meeting; and I do not think that this document, which after all must be considered as the foundation of our Meeting to-day, has given any warrant to expect, that such a subject might be entered upon. With regard to those gentlemen, whom we had great pleasure in seeing last night, I think that this was fully explained and understood:—and, I still hope, satisfactorily explained and understood,—that, whilst such a reference might fairly be made as might be necessary to vindicate their own character—whilst such a reference would be perfectly legitimate,—on the other hand, to go into the question at large would be a course, which would probably have a most injurious effect on our Meeting. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Mr. NICHOLSON.—I rise to order, Sir; I take it that we are pledged, as far as the convenience of the Meeting will allow, to act in conformity with the plan which you were kind enough in the morning sitting to

lay down; and that it is necessary that we should hear the Deputies from the different places represented.

The Rev. S. GREEN.—I submit, as a point of order, that we have had no statement from Leicester, no doubt for a very good reason; because of the refusal to receive that letter. This discussion, therefore, very appropriately, as I conceive, and very rightly, arises on that question.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—I submit to the Chairman, as a matter of order, that if there be no report ready from Leicester, we must proceed to the next place from which there are Deputies. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN.—I think I must rule to that effect. I think our friends will be disappointed if we do not go on to the next place.

The Rev. S. GREEN.—You are assuredly, Mr. Chairman,—(interruption, and cries of “Spoke, spoke.”)

The CHAIRMAN.—You must be short, Mr. Green, in saying what you have to say.

The Rev. Mr. STOVELL.—I merely rise—(renewed interruption.)

The Rev. Mr. Stovell and the Rev. Mr. Green here both attempted to address the Meeting; and the former said, “I am in possession of the chair.”

The CHAIRMAN said—I must, as a personal favour, request one thing of my friends around me, and another thing from the gentlemen before me. I ought not to have said, as a *personal* favour, but for the sake of the great common cause. Allow me first to ask of my friends near me, to listen to a few observations from Mr. Green; and allow me, on the other hand, to request of him, that these observations may be as short as possible.

The Rev. S. GREEN.—I say, Sir, that the refusal to receive that letter from Leicester was in effect the refusal of a communication from Leicester. (Hear.) That communication is called for. It is in the Chairman’s pocket. He has—as he thinks, wisely and properly—refused to read it. Against that I say nothing, except that this question of order naturally and necessarily arises, in my view, on that point. I also come to this Meeting, Mr. Chairman, in the name of a large body of persons, who feel as my friend Mr. Mursell has stated his constituents at Leicester feel. I thought, Mr. Chairman, that last night there was given by the Committee, to the gentlemen who waited on that Committee at a late hour in the evening, the fullest liberty of speech. (A voice from the platform, “Look to the resolution on your ticket, read your ticket.”) I am told to read the ticket. Gentlemen, a deputation waited on the Anti-Maynooth Committee last night, when this question was brought forward. We said, “We have understood, from the tenor of certain resolutions which have been published, that some restriction on our speech is intended. Is that correct or is it not?” Gentlemen, the Chairman of the Committee answered me in these words, “While forbearance in respect to the differences between the parties comprehended in the Conference will be necessary throughout all the discussions in that Conference, and while all argument either for or against Church Establishments in those discussions is deemed highly inexpedient by the Committee, they have not intended and do not purpose such restriction as that apprehended by the Deputation.” Now, Gentlemen, I ask you whether we are not, under that intimation, perfectly entitled— (Loud cries of “No, no.”)

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—Gentlemen, I beg to put it to you, as a point of order, whether you can permit this sort of personal attack on the Chairman, and this attempt to produce controversy, to go on? or whether, according to that which was understood to be the great object of the Meeting, and properly and strictly the order of business for the evening, you will proceed to hear the reports of gentlemen connected with the remaining districts, as to the state of feeling against the Maynooth Grant? I submit to you, whether you will allow your respected Chairman thus to be drawn into a personal controversy? (Hear, hear.) Right or wrong—I believe rightly—but right or wrong, your Chairman has decided the point of order; and the other gentlemen, of whom I wish to speak and think with all respect,—the other gentlemen must submit to the decision of the Chair. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, the two parties having respectfully and kindly complied with my request, the one in hearing our friend, and the other in addressing us so shortly, I may now consider the question as disposed of. I will now proceed to the other places. (Cheers, amidst which a few gentlemen assembled in one particular part of the room retired.) We shall now proceed to hear the reports from that *little village*, which we neglected this morning, namely, Birmingham. (Laughter.)

The Rev. Dr. REED having read over the names of several of the Deputies from Birmingham,

The Rev. J. ROBERTS, Independent Minister, was called upon by the Chairman.—Sir, when I alluded this morning to the possibility of the little village of Birmingham being passed over in this Meeting, it was from no desire of personally intruding on your attention; but, having been honoured by the congregation of my much-esteemed friend, John Angell James, who, I regret to say, is not present to-day to represent Birmingham in his own delightful manner, I did feel anxious, that the parties whom I represented should have, through me, a fair hearing. With regard to the congregation whom I have been selected to represent, I rejoice in being able to assure you, Sir, and the Meeting at large,—and I would also have assured our friends from Leicester, if they had not departed (laughter),—that they consider, that in meeting as we do to-day, and as they met at Birmingham, we do not compromise one iota of our principles as Dissenters, nor imply for one moment, that we are ashamed of our peculiarities. After holding for a quarter of a century a place in the ranks of the Nonconformists, and that, not through the prejudices of education, but I trust from enlightened conviction, I can say that I have never yet been ashamed of my profession. (Cheers.) But, Sir, there are times when prominence may be given to peculiarities; and there are other times, when (without being put out of sight) they may be kept in abeyance. (Cheers.) I shall, Mr. Chairman, leave my friend and my brother, if he will allow me to call him so, the Rev. G. S. Bull, Secretary to our Anti-Maynooth Society at Birmingham, to enter more into particulars. I would just inform you, however, of one or two facts in reference to this movement in Birmingham, and leave it to him to supply my deficiencies. Petitions have emanated, I believe, from each of the churches and congregations; and, in all those coming from Dissenting churches, we had no hesitation in giving prominence to that, to which, as Dissenters, we believed it right to give prominence. You may

judge what that was. (Hear.) But when, in consequence of the general feeling which seemed to arise spontaneously, the laymen of Birmingham were led to call a General Meeting, in order that the public opinion of the Town might be expressed, I am happy to say, that the petition agreed to was drawn up by the same hand which expressed our Nonconformist peculiarities in the more private petition. Those peculiarities were, as I think, Sir Culling, wisely suppressed in the general petition, which received the signatures of nearly 6,000 persons. The Town Meeting was attended by the Clergy of Birmingham, and by almost all the leading characters. In that Meeting, Dissenters, Wesleyans, and persons of all denominations, were most happily conjoined. (Cheers.) That Meeting was characterised by the same spirit which marked the Meeting this morning; and which, I trust, will characterise the remainder of our proceedings. We were far from indulging in anything vituperative, or anything that could indicate, that we grudged the liberties, civil and religious, of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. I understand that Dr. Walsh (a Roman Catholic Bishop) was in the gallery, which was studded rather thickly with Romish Priests from Oscott; and I believe that scarcely any Catholic minister or gentleman could take offence at anything that was said. The whole Meeting was also characterised by that unanimity and gentleness towards each other, which have distinguished the present Conference. Mutual confessions were made at that Meeting, that, in past days, Protestants might have been wanting in the reciprocities of charity one towards the other; and it was observed, that the goodness of God may have permitted this event, to bring us into happy union. I doubt not that, when we more fully understand one another on certain points, and are permitted to have a little useful and healthy contact with one another, we shall be improved in our general spirit. With reference to the feelings displayed in the different congregations of Birmingham, let me say, that I believe they all cherish the same views. There is, in this Maynooth Grant, that which is entirely repugnant to our feelings as Nonconformists; but we are desirous of uniting on the ground of our common Protestantism. Everything that is allied to patriotism,—everything that is allied to pure loyalty,—everything that is allied to spiritual religion,—calls upon us to combine our efforts for the same object. (Cheers.) I shall not take advantage of the opportunity granted me by immodestly trespassing on your time. There are many here who desire, and whose duty it is, to address the Conference. I thank you for your kindness and respectful attention.

The Rev. GEORGE S. BULL, Rector of St. Matthew's, Birmingham.—There is one remark, Sir, which I would make respecting the shortness of time allowed for all the operations connected with this movement. The very great haste with which the conductor of this measure in Parliament has endeavoured to hurry it forward—I think I may, with your consent, say the very indecent haste—(hear, hear)—has thrown many of us, in the Country, into a little confusion: we have not had the opportunity of making our arrangements so perfectly as we should otherwise have done. (Cheers.) But, with regard to Birmingham, I must say, that the readiness with which the very first movement of an united character was received in that Town, facilitated all our measures, and rendered them, from first to last, exceedingly



pleasant and unanimous. I am extremely happy to say, that both the Representatives of Birmingham have given perfect satisfaction, by their conduct in Parliament in reference to this measure. To show how entirely we are represented in Parliament, let me observe that, as Mr. Roberts who has just addressed you knows, one of our representatives goes entirely with him in his views concerning Voluntaryism; while the opinion of the other is entirely the other way. (Laughter.) We are very well pleased with both of them. Then, Sir, I would remark that in our Meeting at Birmingham, there was one feeling expressed by almost every person who rose to state his views; and it was, that every exertion should be made, that is lawful and right, to induce Her Majesty, to relieve herself from the great difficulties in which her Ministers have placed her (cheers), and to defend herself from the great danger in which her very Throne is placed, by casting herself on the affections of her people. (Loud cheering.) I do affirm and believe, that, if this measure be permitted to pass, and to become the law of the land, it will shake the foundations of the British Protestant Throne. (Hear, hear.) I say this not unadvisedly. It is a Protestant Throne, and the succession is a Protestant succession. (Hear, hear.) If the Roman Catholic religion is to be acknowledged in this manner, the oath of the Sovereign may next be altered; and then, Sir,—I dare not say the rest. (Hear, hear.)

I said, I dare not say the rest; prudence and propriety prevent me. But I love the Protestant dynasty; and I am prepared to stand by that dynasty, for the sake of the liberties and the religion of my country. (Cheers.) There is one other point which I must distinctly declare to be part of my delegation. It is, that you should endeavour, by every means in your power, to procure the dissolution of Parliament. (Cheers.) I think this is fair. It is acknowledged in the House of Commons, that they are not representing, but misrepresenting, the great body of the people. If such be the case, what remains but that we should represent ourselves? (Cheers.) And let that day come when it may, my own firm purpose is, to endeavour, by every lawful and proper means, to keep this warning before the electors of England; and that too in the very heart of the kingdom, where I live; so that, when the day of Election comes, they may have it firmly impressed on their minds. Sir, I am not going to detain the Meeting—feeling, as I do, that there are many other gentlemen who are desirous of addressing it; but I wish to say a few more words before I sit down. There are a great many Irishmen here. Now, I like an Irishman. There is something honest—something open-hearted and generous—about an Irishman. I love the Irish well; I wish to say to my beloved Protestant brethren from Ireland, that I have mistaken my own heart—that I have mistaken the hearts of my countrymen, and that I have mistaken the hearts of the representatives of Protestant feeling in this country now present, if they are not prepared to stand by the Irish Protestant clergy. (Cheers.) Irrespectively of any views which we profess or entertain on the subject of Voluntaryism or Endowments, we will stand by them on the broad ground of Protestant truth against Popish error. (Cheers.) Sir, we are met together as an united body. There has been, it is true, a little skirmishing; but it has come to little after all. I wish those brethren most heartily farewell, and I wish them well—(cheers)—hoping and trusting that

all of us may be enabled to forget any feeling of irritation which has arisen in our minds. (Hear, hear.) We are Christians. We can forget all these things; they pass away from us like the wild blast that blows for a moment, and then is gone. One of the speakers this morning spoke of our being all in the same boat. Now, I am a little acquainted with maritime affairs, having once gone out to a missionary station; and I know very well that, when a ship is going down in the quarter, it will soon fare very ill with those who are in the fore-castle. And so, when the machinations of Popery are being put forth to strand the ship of Protestantism, it becomes those on the fore-castle and those on the deck to make common cause, in order to save her from destruction. (Cheers.)

Allow me to supply one omission. I should not do justice to several congregations in Birmingham, if I did not say, that there are a large number of Protestant dissenters in that town, who, though they have not united with us, have as hearty a detestation of this Bill as any one. Although they found their opposition on a ground in which some of us do not participate, they have an undoubted right to their own views; and they have done their duty as regards this measure. I should give it as my opinion, that the Wesleyan Methodists of Birmingham have been the hardest workers.

The Rev. EDWARD WALKER, Wesleyan Minister, of Birmingham.—I beg to make one remark, in the absence of my brother Deputies, whom I expected to see. I request the liberty of saying, that I believe the Wesleyan Methodists of Birmingham will yield to none in intense anxiety to defeat the measure which has brought us together this day. Every congregation of Wesleyan Methodists in the town of Birmingham has most earnestly come forward to sign petitions against it; and I believe that whatever you, in your united capacity, may conclude to be desirable to be done, after this Conference has closed, the Wesleyan Methodists of Birmingham, as well as the other denominations, will ardently endeavour to do, to the utmost of their ability.

The Rev. JACOB STANLEY, Wesleyan Minister, of Bristol.—I did hope, Sir, that I should not stand alone as the representative of the Anti-Maynooth feeling in Bristol. There was another gentleman appointed to come to this Conference, who, I am sorry to say, is not here. Why he is not, I cannot tell. He is a most respectable magistrate of that city; and I am convinced that, had he been here, he would have represented the state of feeling in Bristol much better than I can. I am here as the representative of the Wesleyans. I represent between three and four thousand members of our Society in that city. Amongst the whole of our body, I am happy to say, I have only met with four persons who at all dissent from this movement. These individuals profess to be very great enemies of Popery; but, at the same time, very great friends to Ireland; and, thinking that this measure will gratify the Irish, they decline to join us. The Protestant feeling of Bristol has been very powerfully excited upon this subject. Sir, the persons whom I represent hate Popery with a perfect hatred. When they read their Bible they do not find in it either purgatory or indulgences, or the worship of angels and saints—they do not discover in their Bibles any of the peculiarities of Popery; and they are hostile to it, because they are friends to Scriptural Christianity. I had the happiness of attending a meeting at Bristol, which was convened by the

Clergy of the Church of England, and which was most numerous and respectably attended. At that meeting, the Rev. Mr. Stowell, whom we had the pleasure of hearing this morning, delivered a most powerful and telling speech. But the Anti-Protestant press grossly misrepresented the speech of that excellent gentleman. And, while alluding to that, I cannot but express a hope that the observations made this morning, by Mr. Stephens of Newport, will not be forgotten. (Hear, hear.) I do hope that the circumstance of the secret having gone out, that the editor of one of the leading journals in that place is a Roman Catholic, will produce some change in the character of that paper. (Hear, hear.) I rejoice, Sir, that this meeting has recovered its peaceful and harmonious tone. I felt the atmosphere in the morning to be very warm, but it was a delightful, Protestant, and united atmosphere; I was fearful to-night that, instead of union and harmony, we should have discord, but I am happy to find that there is no probability of my fear being realised. (Hear, hear.) I, at least, understood from the circular which I received, that we were all to merge our minor differences, and to combine our energies simply against Popery; and I am happy to find, that that is the general feeling pervading this meeting. I conceive that Sir Robert Peel is at present placed in an unenviable position. I feel for him, Sir; I do feel for him; for he has most unnecessarily placed himself in a position, from which I know not how he will extricate himself. If he should carry the measure, he will be despised and execrated by the Protestant people of this country; and if he does not carry it, he will have excited hopes among the Irish Roman Catholics, to be followed by a disappointment which will drive them almost to madness. His position, I repeat, is a most unenviable one; and I believe there is not a gentleman here present who would consent to be in that position, for the honour of being Prime Minister. I read, Sir, in *The Times*, a few days ago, a statement of Mr. Hume's in the House of Commons—That a monster meeting was about to be held in the metropolis; and the Honourable Member wished to know, what course Sir Robert Peel would take with respect to it. Sir, I suppose *this* is the Monster Meeting referred to. And what was the reply of Sir Robert Peel? He said, he was not afraid of that Meeting. Why, Sir, he tells us that he is not afraid of any Meeting; he tells us that he is not afraid of O'Connell. If he be not afraid of O'Connell, why has he proposed this measure? What else but fear prompted him to do what he has done? (Hear, hear.) He says, he is not afraid of this Monster Meeting. Then why has he refused to receive a deputation? (Hear, hear.) I believe Sir Robert Peel is really afraid of this Conference; and I do hope, that from this Assembly such a feeling will go forth, and be diffused throughout the land, that the measure after all will not be carried. Bristol, as you are aware, is represented by two Members. One of those Members, Mr. Miles, in consequence of the recent death of his father, is not in attendance in his place in Parliament. The other Representative, Mr. Berkeley, was, I know, in favour of the measure; but, Sir, he is not like Mr. Macaulay, Mr. Gladstone, and some others, who say, "We are wiser than seven men that can render a reason, and we will vote as we think proper—without caring anything at all about the opinion of our constituents." Mr. Berkeley, though in favour of the measure, has stated, in answer to some of his constituents, and in reply to myself, (for I

had a correspondence with him on the subject,) that—although he thinks the measure is on the whole a good one, considered as a measure of Education—yet, as his constituents are of another mind, while he cannot consistently vote against the Maynooth Grant, after hitherto supporting it, he will not from this time vote in its favour. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. S. NICHOLSON, Baptist Minister, of Plymouth.—I am anxious to say a few words, on account of the peculiar position in which, as a Baptist Minister, I seem to be placed this evening,—on account of some gentlemen having, as I venture to think, interrupted the proceedings of the Meeting, and put things out of their regular course. When it was stated, that such a one was a Baptist Minister, the question was put to me—“Are the Baptists then opposed to this movement?” Permit me to say, that I may truly affirm, with respect to the whole of the Baptists, that, to a man, they cordially approve of this movement. (Hear, hear.) The fact is, Sir, they are earnest Voluntaries; and I venture to say, that it has been their suspicions—(suspicions in which I myself at one time partook)—as to the incompatibility of their taking part in this Meeting with their unequivocal Voluntarism, which has occasioned their holding back in the manner they have done; and I believe the same feeling induced those gentlemen, to whom I have alluded, to retire. (Hear, hear.) But, Sir, if the Meeting should require to be assured of the fact, that the gentlemen who have retired, and the numerous body of Baptists in this kingdom, hate Popery,—such an assurance I myself am able to give. (Cheers.) I must apologise for this allusion, which, under other circumstances, would have been repugnant to my feelings. Now, Sir, let me say a word in reference to the position which I occupy, in connexion with another Minister who is now present. As Deputies from Plymouth, we represent four distinct dissenting congregations, who, in this matter, have acted unitedly, and have requested us to appear here to represent their feelings. Now, with respect to the general feeling in Plymouth, I believe that, without exception, the Evangelical Dissenters of that town are strongly opposed to the intended Grant. I know also, that many of the Clergy have acted energetically in endeavouring to get up petitions against it. I am aware also, that the Wesleyan body have acted with their usual zeal; but I shall leave it to my respected brother of that denomination, to refer more particularly to their efforts in connexion with this question. With regard to the feeling in the town at large, I may state, that there are some persons who abstain from opposing the Grant, because they do not wish to endanger the seats of the present Cabinet. (Hear, hear.) Our first proceeding was, to hold a public Meeting, at which the resolutions were founded on general grounds of opposition to the Grant; and a petition was prepared, which was intended to secure the co-operation of all parties. Since that, we have addressed a second petition to the Legislature, against the third reading of the Bill; and further, we wrote a letter to each of our Members. Mr. Gill happened to be in town when this letter was prepared. That to the other Member, who was not in town, was forwarded to his Lordship. I will not trespass on the time of the Meeting by reading the letter; but will merely state, that we have expressed, in very strong language, our disapprobation of the measure; and have declared, that we are thoroughly dissatisfied with the weakness, the inconsistency, and

the shallow expediency which is indicated in the arguments used in its favour. I believe, I have now said all that it concerns this Meeting to know, with regard to the feeling in Plymouth, and the earnest uncompromising hostility with which, though not all on the same grounds, we are opposed to the measure before Parliament.

The Rev. Mr. NYE, Wesleyan Minister, of Plymouth.—If my excellent friend, Mr. Nicholson, had not spoken of me as the representative of certain Protestant Nonconformists, I should not have presumed to do so. I am, however, the bearer of certain dispatches from a considerable number of Wesleyan Electors of Plymouth, in which they very concisely, but very frankly, intimate to their Representatives, or rather their *Misrepresentatives*, what their feelings are in reference to their conduct. Both these Representatives have expressed their intention of voting in favour of this measure; and one of them has broadly affirmed, that, in these days, an oath is nothing,—that the oath which is taken as a qualification for sitting in Parliament, and entering upon certain Municipal and other offices, is merely a matter of form, and not at all binding upon the conscience. In the dispatches of which I have spoken, it is intimated to the two Members, by a large number of Wesleyan Electors in Plymouth, that the sooner they dispatch their Parliamentary business, hasten home, and resign their seats into the hands of those who are professedly their constituents, the better. (Laughter.) I attach, Sir, the greatest importance to those communications, emanating as they do from men who are determined that, as far as they can promote that object, moral principles shall have the ascendancy over political principles; and who say, “We are prepared to sacrifice all our private political predilections to the interest of the great cause; and we will look out henceforth for Christian men.” (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. W. SPENCER, Independent Minister, of Devonport.—We have been somewhat slow, Sir, in our movement upon this question in the town of Devonport; although, since the movement commenced, we have been travelling by a quick train. I need not advert to the circumstances which occasioned the slowness of our progress in the first instance; suffice it to say, that, after considerable difficulty, arising partly from political, and partly from Ecclesiastical feelings, we were enabled to convene in our Town-hall, on Monday evening last—(a building about the size of the room in which we are now assembled)—the most numerous, the most unanimous, and the most interesting Meeting which has been held in that Town within the memory of the oldest inhabitants. Upon the platform of that Meeting, persons were assembled on the broad Protestant principle upon which this Meeting is constituted; and the Resolution, to which allusion has been made more than once this evening, constituted the basis of our union on that occasion. We had on the platform, Clergymen, Wesleyans, Baptists, and Independents: a circumstance which no one ever remembered witnessing before in the town of Devonport. In the first instance, we had a little opposition, but it did us a vast amount of good. (Laughter.) It warmed our hearts, and enabled us to understand better the grounds upon which we had assembled; and it tended to elicit the exact amount of feeling, or rather of diversity of feeling, which obtained in that Meeting; so that, when the first Resolution was submitted to the Meeting, asserting the broad Protestant principle on which we were assembled, no more

than six hands were held up against it. I ventured to assert on that occasion, in the course of a few observations which I addressed to the parties assembled, that I, for one, would never consent to sacrifice Protestant feeling to political expediency. (Cheers.) The Meeting responded to that sentiment, in as loud and rapturous a manner as it has been responded to in this room to-day. I ventured to assert at that Meeting, that when the time came, at which we might be called to test those Protestant principles in a different manner from that in which we were then testing theirs—(alluding to the Members for the Town)—my principle would be—Not men, but measures: and the entire assembly responded to that sentiment. I ventured to assert, also, that, if we were defeated in the House of Commons, or in the House of Lords, we should then be prepared to approach the Throne, and to remind the Queen, with all that loyalty which is due to the Sovereign, that the Throne of this Country is based upon Protestant principles; and more rapturous cheering I never heard at any Meeting in my life, than was called forth by that sentiment. I merely mention those things, to show the position which the Members for the Town of Devonport occupy, in relation to the present question. I entertain not a shadow of a doubt, that when an Election takes place in that Town,—whatever may be the case as regards Mr. Tuffnell, (who very wisely stated why he voted for the Second Reading of the Bill,)—as regards the other Member for that Town, I have every reason to believe that, in consequence of his conduct in respect to this measure, notwithstanding the strong representations made to him,—there is no chance whatever of his representing that Town in a future Parliament. I wish it to be distinctly understood, that I have no further authority for that assertion, than what may be derived from the state of feeling which was evinced in the Meeting. Let me observe, however, that that Meeting consisted of the largest number of men I ever saw assembled at any Meeting in Devonport. It consisted, in fact, almost exclusively of men; and, on looking round the assembly, I found, that it consisted very generally of the constituents of Devonport. I have reason also for asserting what I have done, from the fact, that Sir George Grey has received from the constituents, who voted for him at the last Election, a considerable number of letters—distinctly telling him, that if he does not mend his conduct in this matter, he must not expect to occupy his seat for Devonport in another Parliament.

The CHAIRMAN.—Dr. Massie wishes to address the Meeting for a few moments, on a matter of importance.

The Rev. Dr. MASSIE.—All I wish to say is, that I have been to the lobby of the House of Commons this evening; and I have seen more than six Members of that House, with whom I have held personal conference. One of these Members said—"We have not had, in the lobby of this House, such personal appeals as were made to us in reference to the Educational clauses of the Factory Bill;" and I must say, that one of the gentlemen whose absence he noted, is a gentleman who is exceedingly near to me. He said, "We have not seen Dr. Bunting in this place." Now I am satisfied, from the report which that gentleman gave as to the feeling of the House, that, if this Meeting of Deputies will exercise its influence upon the Members of the House,—before the end of this week, a change will come over the spirit of

their dream, which will be exceedingly gratifying to us who are watching their imaginations. (Cheers, and laughter.) The Delegates from Manchester have an appointment this evening, with not fewer than five of the Representatives of the people; and if they leave them not converted, it will not be the fault of the Delegates. I hope that this hint will have the proper effect; and that, as there is no House to-night, on leaving this room, gentlemen will find out the lodgings of their Representatives; and let them know what tidings they have brought from their respective districts.

The Rev. Dr. HALLEY.—I do hope, that some impression will be made by what has fallen from our friend, Dr. Massie. I find that we, who come from Manchester, are invited to meet the leaders of the Free Trade party—Mr. Cobden and Dr. Bowring—at half-past eight o'clock this evening; and we will do our best, I assure you, in the interview.

The Rev. A. STRACHAN, from Lincoln.—There is but one feeling in Lincoln in reference to this great question. Although there is a great diversity of opinion in that town, regarding Religious and other matters, all parties are agreed as to the badness of this Bill. One of our Representatives—Colonel Sibthorp—has, I believe, by the course he has adopted in reference to this measure, given great satisfaction to his constituents. Our other Representative has imitated the example of the gentleman to whom a previous speaker alluded; and has given no opinion at all upon this subject. I am happy to say, however, that I have brought up a strong appeal, which I shall have the honour of presenting to that gentleman to-morrow. It is signed by several of his most respectable constituents, who tell him, in the most unequivocal terms, that should he either support the Bill, or absent himself from the division, they are prepared to withdraw their suffrages when a favourable opportunity presents itself. I am happy to say, that precisely the same kind of feeling pervades the Electors of Boston, and many other Towns. I have visited all these Towns within the last fortnight; and I have the pleasure of informing you, that they have one or more representatives in this room. It must not be supposed that Lincolnshire has been either behind in feeling, or in the manifestation of feeling, on this great question. I will not now detain this Meeting by any special reference to facts; but I do hope that, by a signal intervention of Divine Providence, the measure will be entirely defeated. Or if the Government of this Country shall, in the face of the general expression of public sentiment, carry this measure into a law, I trust that its days will be numbered, and that the constituency of their Country will bestow their suffrages upon a different class of men.

The Rev. T. KING, Cranbrook, Lincoln.—I feel exceedingly happy, in having an opportunity of confirming to the letter, what my respected colleague has already stated to the meeting. Not only has there been an unanimous feeling against the measure in question, since it was first reported to the public, in Lincoln and its vicinity; but they have, to a man, as far as I know, evinced an entire abhorrence of the Bill; and shown what, I think Dr. Johnson has somewhere commended, the property or power of hating well. (Laughter.) The Meeting doubtless is aware that, in agricultural districts, there is not the same facility, either for ascertaining, or calling out feeling, as in the manufacturing. The people are scattered over the face of the Country,

and have no means of acquiring that information which is easily acquired in the manufacturing districts. But whenever the matter has been explained in our congregations,—whenever the subject has been brought forward, there has been a most hearty response to the sentiments expressed, and an earnest wish and prayer poured forth, that this Bill may be utterly defeated. Never surely did any of our senators more grossly mistake the feeling in different parts of the kingdom, than did Sir Robert Peel when he intimated, in his place in the House of Commons, that petitions from the Country were the mere echoes of certain propositions emanating from certain parties and Committees in London. This was certainly, begging Sir Robert Peel's pardon for saying so, a most egregious blunder as regards Lincoln; for, prior to the time at which we received communications from London, a general petition was in course of signature in the whole County of Lincoln. The Rev. Mr. Scott, Lecturer of one of the churches, together with the Rev. Mr. Bradford, Incumbent of St. Mary's, set about getting up that petition, and taking it round the County. On Monday morning, a number of Church friends, and likewise a number of Independents, connected with the congregation of the Rev. Mr. Burne in Lincoln, came and requested that we would, at this Conference, represent them as prepared cordially to unite in any effort the Conference might deem it proper to make. I have no doubt whatever, that, had the Rev. Mr. Scott's circumstances and health permitted, he would have been present on this occasion, to state to you distinctly the feeling which exists in the Church, so far as he is acquainted with it. The Rev. Mr. Burne would also undoubtedly have been here, had he not been on the Continent for the benefit of his health. His congregation have forwarded a petition numerous and respectably signed. The petition sent up by the Clergymen just mentioned shows what is the feeling in that quarter; and the numerous petitions which have been sent up from our congregations, in Lincoln and its vicinity, sufficiently prove what is the feeling of the Wesleyan Methodists on the same subject. At the time when the circular from the Committee came to hand, I happened to have an opportunity of laying certain extracts from it before the congregation,—a congregation by far the largest in the city of Lincoln; and had Sir Robert Peel witnessed the response on that occasion;—had he observed the feeling evinced, whilst I endeavoured to call the attention of the congregation to the evils of Popery, and whilst I reminded them of what Popery had done in Tahiti, of what Popery is doing in New Zealand, of what Popery has done in Spain, in Portugal, and in South America;—had Sir Robert Peel witnessed the feeling evinced in response to my observations, satisfied I am that never would he have put forth the scandalous statement, that the petitions of the Country were not the result of sincere or strong feeling, but simply an echo of propositions emanating from London.

W. BACON, Esq. from Louth.—I would only say, as regards the town which I represent, that the feeling of opposition to the measure amongst the Wesleyan Methodists is unanimous. We have sent up thirty-seven petitions from Louth and its vicinity, numerous signed; and a petition has also been sent up from the Town. The feeling is unanimous, both in the Established Church and amongst the Wesleyans.

The CHAIRMAN.—As the Meeting is now full, and this may be considered



the best time for ascertaining its opinions, two motions will now be made,—one on the subject of Sir Robert Peel's refusal to receive a deputation from the Conference, and the other on the subject of Finance. The first Resolution will be moved by Dr. Massie.

The Rev. Dr. MASSIE, Independent Minister, from Manchester.—I shall not make a speech, Mr. Chairman, having, I believe, made one already; but, the motion being one of great importance, I hope I shall be heard. The Resolution which I have to move is this,—

“That the members of this Conference, during the morning of Thursday, do personally wait on those Members of Parliament with whom they are respectively connected; and do represent to them, in the most emphatic terms, the adverse feeling of the great majority of their constituents to the Maynooth Endowment Bill, earnestly entreating their opposition to the Third Reading of the Bill; and assuring them, that it is only by the adoption of such a course, that they will be enabled adequately to represent the wishes and opinions of their constituents; and that they be so obliging as to report on their success to this Conference.”

I most cordially move this resolution, Sir Culling; and I do so with a single observation. I hope that every gentleman, on visiting, or having an interview with, Members of Parliament, will avoid anything in the shape of dictation to them, in reference to the course which they should pursue. Our object is to gain their opposition to the Bill; not to offend them, or to excite what is vulgarly called their monkey (laughter); but with good-will, with kindness, and with affection, to represent to them the fact, that their support of this Bill,—or even their negative support of the Government, by abstaining from voting against it,—will surely damage them in the estimation of the constituency of the Country. (Hear, hear.)

Rev. J. JUKES, of Bedford, said,—I feel great pleasure in seconding the Resolution. Allow me to observe that our friends, by writing to Mr. Astell, the Member for Bedfordshire, induced him to vote against the Second Reading; and by writing to Viscount Alford they also induced him to stay away from the Second Reading.

The CHAIRMAN.—Before I put this Resolution, allow me to say, that the Conference will not meet to-morrow before twelve o'clock; and therefore gentlemen, by waiting on their Members, may easily contrive to have interviews with them before we commence our sitting.

The Resolution was then put, and carried unanimously.

Mr. E. BAINES, jun., of Leeds.—Sir, the Resolution which I have to submit to this large Meeting refers to a point of great constitutional and practical importance. It has reference to the refusal of Sir Robert Peel to receive a deputation from the Conference which is now assembled. It appears to me, Sir, that this refusal on the part of the Prime Minister is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution and to the practice of official men. (Cheers.) I believe I am justified in saying,—and I have taken some pains to ascertain that I speak correctly,—that there never has, at any time within the memory of man, been a deputation nearly so large in point of numbers, or nearly answering in point of character, to that which is now assembled in this room. There have been deputations on many subjects of great public importance;—on the

Anti-Slavery question, for instance ;—on various Religious and Political subjects ; but I am authorised by those who have had great experience in the matter to say, that they never knew a Deputation comparable to that, the Members of which are assembled in this hall to-day. Coming then from all parts of the kingdom, as Sir Robert Peel was informed the Deputations would, it does seem to me, that it was the duty of the Prime Minister to listen to the statements that might have been laid before him by those gentlemen. The plea which Sir Robert Peel urges, as his excuse for not doing so, is one which is altogether evasive ; and which, as it happens, he himself has proved to be entirely without foundation. (Hear, hear.) Sir Robert Peel pleads, that it is incompatible with his official duty, when a measure has received copious discussion during ten nights' debate in the House of Commons, to discuss it in personal conference with deputations, if it be a measure of public and general policy. Now has Sir Robert Peel's practice answered to that principle ? It has not. (Hear, hear.) During the last Session of Parliament, Sir Robert Peel adopted measures, which completely put him out of court in making this plea. A measure was decided upon in the House of Commons, after many nights' debate. I refer to a resolution of Lord Ashley with regard to the Ten Hours' Bill. After that Resolution had been passed, not only Sir Robert Peel, but Sir James Graham, received several deputations on the subject ; and not only was that done, but Sir Robert Peel so effectually whips up his Ministerial pack, that a minority of nine was converted into a majority of 141. (Hear, hear.) Then I say, Sir Robert Peel's practice is directly in the teeth of that principle, which he would here allege as an excuse for refusing to receive the Deputation. But that is not the only occasion on which Sir Robert Peel has proved, that he did not consider the debates in the House of Commons as deciding a public question. Last Session, after the House of Commons had come to a decision adverse to the Government, with respect to the Sugar Duties, Sir Robert Peel again whipped up his Members, and reversed the decision of the House. There is yet another example of the same kind, to which I will shortly advert. Dr. Bunting has been alluded to to-night. Dr. Bunting will bear me out in saying, that, after Sir James Graham's Factory Education Bill of 1843 had been brought forward and discussed in Parliament, he, accompanied by other individuals and several Deputies, waited upon the Ministers, and were received by them in order to give them information, and to discuss with them that principle. I say, therefore, that not only the principles of the Constitution, but the practice of Sir Robert Peel himself, in successive Sessions, has clearly taken away from him the ground, upon which he would fain excuse himself in this refusal. But, I would say further, that he himself, by the language which he used recently to our honoured Chairman, laid a ground, on which he was bound in justice and in fairness to receive this Deputation. When Sir Culling, accompanied by a Deputation, waited upon Sir Robert Peel, and told him what was the number of the petitions which would probably be presented against this Bill, Sir Robert Peel made that declaration, which has several times been referred to to-day,—that they knew how petitions were got up ; that they were prompted and manufactured in London ; and were merely so many echoes, from various parts of the Country, of the suggestions of a Committee sitting in the Metropolis. Now the very fact of his

having thus endeavoured to disparage the petitions of the people, and to take away from them their value,—that very fact, I say, laid the ground for our claim (cheers) to be permitted to give him personal assurance,—as individuals coming from all parts of the country, from the Land's End to John o'Groat's House, and from the German Ocean to the Atlantic,—of the feelings and opinions of the people among whom we live—of all classes, parties, and sections. (Hear.) I say then, that we had a right to demand this interview with Sir Robert Peel. He says, that it is not for him to discuss this question with us. I reply, that we did not ask him to discuss the question. If we had done so, he might have had some ground for that plea. Our note did not prefer any such pretension or claim. It conveyed a simple request—that we might wait upon him, in order to *give him information*. Sir Robert Peel has refused to hear that information; and has grounded his refusal on a plea, which is altogether unconstitutional, and which is negated by his own practice under similar circumstances. (Cheers.) I will only further say, that, as far as I know the feeling of the Country,—(and I have been a close observer of political movements, and of the movements of public bodies—movements on all kinds of subjects, Political and Ecclesiastical, for many years,)—I never knew anything comparable to the unanimity which prevails amongst all classes, parties, and sections, in opposition to this measure. I have known feeling more intense at first; for instance, on the Reform Bill; but every attestation that we receive proves, that, as the public come more fully to understand this matter, and more clearly to perceive what it involves, their opposition is strengthened. We have heard from every part of England, Scotland, and Ireland, in this hall to-day, that public feeling is daily becoming more intense, more unanimous, and more irreconcilable in its hatred to Popery. I will not further detain the Meeting, because I am an advocate for short speeches; but I will at once lay before the Meeting what seems to me to be a just expression of our opinions on the important matter before us. The Resolution which I beg to move is,—

“That the refusal of Sir Robert Peel to receive a deputation from this body has excited the astonishment and deep regret of the Meeting;—that, in the interview sought for by the Deputies, they would have been able to give the Prime Minister authentic information of the strong religious objections felt to the Maynooth Endowment Bill by Her Majesty's Protestant subjects of all parties, classes, and sections in every part of the kingdom;—that the Deputies are of opinion, that in the spirit of our free Constitution, the Prime Minister ought to have received the information thus proffered to him;—and that this Resolution be forwarded to Sir Robert Peel by the Chairman, accompanied by an assurance that the present deputations are altogether unprecedented in point of numbers, and that the Deputies and their fellow-countrymen are irreconcilably hostile to the Endowment of the Roman Catholic religion, in the present, or any other form.”

The Rev. ALEXANDER BELL, from Birmingham.—I feel extreme pleasure in seconding the Resolution. I feel that we cannot speak too strongly upon this subject. The Prime Minister has hitherto treated our Protestant feelings with contempt.

The Rev. JOHN BROAD, from Hitching.—I beg to observe, that I was in the House of Commons on Monday evening last ; and while there, I heard Mr. Hindley state, that if Sir Robert Peel would consent to make this an annual charge, instead of binding it upon the Country by a Bill, his opposition would cease; and he would endeavour to induce the Dissenters of England to withdraw their opposition to the measure. Sir Robert Peel said on that occasion, he had entirely misunderstood the ground of the Dissenters' opposition. I thought this fact ought to be stated to the Meeting, in order that Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Hindley may be undeceived in this important point.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think our object will have been quite as much gained by Sir Robert Peel's refusal of an interview, as it would have been by his granting it ; because I am quite sure that public sympathy, which in England is always in favour of fair play, will be called out in our favour.

The Resolution was then put, and carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Rev. Robert M'Donald, of the Free Church of Scotland, who has made great exertions on behalf of that Church, has a Resolution to propose, containing a plan with respect to Finance.

The Rev. ROBERT M'DONALD.—Sir, and Christian friends, I felt rather averse to move this Resolution, from the circumstance that I was surrounded by so many of my esteemed brethren, who are so much more able than myself to do justice to it. The Resolution put into my hands is as follows :—

“That this Conference, entirely approving the exertions put forth by the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, and sure that a considerable expenditure must have taken place, and is still needful—pledges itself to aid the cause, both by present contributions, and also by raising funds in the various neighbourhoods from which its members have been severally sent.”

I do feel that this is one of the most important of our Resolutions ; for if we leave this Conference, and go back into the Country, without doing anything more than what has been done, the whole Conference will end in nothing. I believe that those who are opposed to us are calculating on the probability, that this enthusiasm will by-and-by cool down, and that it will all end in Petitions and Deputations. Now, there is nothing which will be more likely to convince them of our determination in no degree to yield, than our coming forward, and giving liberally to this cause. (Hear, hear.) We must all have rejoiced to see that God has raised up so noble-hearted a man to lead us,—a man whom He has gifted so highly, and upon whom He has also bestowed grace, to enable him to conduct our proceedings. (Cheers.) It will be disgraceful to us, if we leave the Committee without the means of carrying out this noble struggle. I am quite sure that, had they larger means, more effectual measures would be adopted ; and I trust, therefore, that we shall exert ourselves to the very utmost. I hope that we shall not be wanting in our duty, and that the Committee will not hesitate to make a large demand when a large demand is necessary. We find by experience in Scotland, that the more we ask, the more we get ; the larger our demands, the more we receive. I was honoured, about a year ago, when that great event took place in Scotland, to assist in raising £50,000, to establish five hundred schools in

that Country. I felt at the time, that if we had proposed to obtain only £5,000, or £10,000, we should have had great difficulty in getting it. (Laughter.) But, having proposed that the sum should be £50,000, in the course of six months we were able to report to the Free General Assembly, that the whole £50,000 had been obtained. In like manner, when we lately stated, that we stood in need of a College, and visited different parts of Scotland to raise the necessary funds, a friend having given us £1000 towards the object, the thought entered my mind, that it would be easy to induce fifty more persons to give the same amount; and in two months we got twenty persons to put down their names for £1000. I feel confident that if £5000 or 10,000, or 50,000 be required for this great object, it will not be withheld. I feel particularly jealous on this point. (Laughter.) What will all our Petitions and Deputations avail, if we do not now make the necessary sacrifice? I feel that the only way in which we can make our testimony really impressive, and make it really tell on the minds of men, is, by showing that we are prepared to make sacrifices of money; and that, if necessary, we are willing to make a greater sacrifice still—to hazard our lives for this great object. But how can any one believe that we would hazard our lives, if we will not make the necessary sacrifice of our money for the great end we have in view? I trust that all the Deputies, when they return to the Country, will make this a matter of conscience before God;—that they will not rest until they stir up all in whom they are interested, to give freely their means as well as their names to this great object. I am perfectly confident that a large sum may be obtained, if each will take the responsibility on himself. With regard to the general question before us, I will just mention, that I appear here this evening as a Deputy from the members of the Free Church, from the members of the Secession Church, and from the members of the Independent Church of Perth. This, I think, is sufficient to show the cordiality with which they unite on this subject;—that, although I am a member of the Free Church, all agreed to send me here to represent their opinions.

The CHAIRMAN.—I beg to say, that the Committee feel, that if every gentleman present will take charge of some half-dozen copies of this circular, we shall, within a few days, have our minds set at rest on the difficult question of Finance.

The Resolution was then seconded by the Rev. Dr. Reed, and put to the Meeting, and carried unanimously.

The Rev. JOHN BLACKBURN.—I have, on behalf of the Committee, to submit a Resolution, which is intended to prepare for the proceedings of to-morrow.

“That in the event that the Bill should pass the House of Commons, it will, in the judgment of this Meeting, become the solemn duty of the people of this Country to address themselves to her Majesty to dissolve that Parliament, the Commons of which have confessedly failed to conform their legislative acts to the almost unanimous opinion of their constituents; and that the Committee do prepare an Address from this Conference to the Queen; and also a Resolution, recommending similar Addresses from all the constituencies of the Empire; and that both be submitted to the Meeting to-morrow evening.”

With respect to addressing the Queen, it is thought, Sir Culling, by the Committee, that it is exceedingly desirable that we should centre upon our great Meeting to-morrow evening the most important action of the Conference; and therefore, that the address to Her Majesty should be voted to-morrow, at the great Meeting in Exeter Hall; and that the Resolution to which this refers, recommending all the Constituencies of the Empire to do so too, should then be submitted for approval. It is necessary, however, that this instruction should go to the Committee to-night, in order that they may prepare the document for approval to-morrow.

The Rev. WILLIAM BUNTING.—It strikes me that the adoption of that Resolution should be left contingent on the event which we yet hope, by vigorous efforts, to avert—the final and peremptory adoption of the measure by the House of Commons. I think we can scarcely venture to anticipate that result by an immediate Petition to Her Majesty. It would imply total despair, which I think the body of the Deputies do not at all feel.

The Rev. J. BLACKBURN.—I beg to say, that that caution has been anticipated by the Committee; and that it is intended to frame the Address contingently. It is felt that, if we delay till the measure passes the Commons; and if, out of courtesy to the Upper House, we wait for the affirmation, or otherwise, of the principle there, the opportunity of acting upon the mind of the Sovereign will have passed away.

The Rev. WILLIAM BUNTING.—I think the contingency does not relate to the House of Lords, but to the House of Commons. The Committee unanimously agreed last night, that we should await the event in the House of Commons; and, I think, they still adhere to that opinion.

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—My strong impression is, that, in all our Conferences on this subject, both yesterday and subsequently in Committee, we have agreed to introduce something expressive of the contingency, that the House of Commons, by the representations of the Deputies, may be yet induced to reject the measure in the Third Reading; and that we should introduce some expression indicating that we apprehended, from the measure having passed the Second Reading, as it has done, and from the tone and spirit of defiance which has been manifested, it is likely to pass the Third Reading; and that, if it should, we shall then take the measures proposed. I think that was our general impression.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—That was exactly the impression of the Committee in their separate sittings. I should not be disposed to say, in a recorded Resolution, that we apprehend an unfavourable issue on the Third Reading. All I would say is, that *in case* of its passing the Third Reading, we should *then* deem it right to take such and such measures. All we meant to say was, that an intimation as to our future proceedings would be desirable at this Meeting; and that we should be instructed and authorised, so far as to consider and prepare these points of business, for your attention and disposal to-morrow. We do not wish this Meeting to be committed, in the haste of the present moment, to those measures, beyond a general Resolution on the subject.

The subject was then adjourned by consent, in order that the Resolution might undergo some alteration.

The Rev. BRABAZON ELLIS, a Clergyman from the Potteries, having been called upon by the Chairman, said—I appear here as a Deputy from a very considerable town in the Staffordshire Potteries—the town of Burslem ; and I am happy to state, that the utmost unanimity exists there, amongst all classes of Protestants, upon this great question. I myself appear here as the Clergyman of one of the churches of that Town, and my colleague is a respectable member of the Wesleyan communion. I believe there is also a Deputy present, from those who approve of the Voluntary System in the same neighbourhood. I wish distinctly to state the general grounds upon which those who sent me to this Conference were opposed to the measure. Sir, we oppose the Grant to Maynooth altogether. We oppose any Grant to Maynooth, under any pretence, on the high and holy ground that, as it is given to support a false religion, we cannot but disapprove of it. I should feel, indeed, that I was rather out of place as a Clergyman, if I did not take that ground, and that alone. I might add, with perfect truth, that we believe the religion of Rome to be injurious, in the highest degree, to the Civil Interests, Rights, and Liberties of any people amongst whom it is established. But we believe worse than that of it. We hold that the oath which Her Most Gracious Majesty swore at her Coronation is perfectly and religiously true. We believe that the Religion of Rome, at present, is as utterly idolatrous as it was in the darkest ages. Sir, I speak not hastily. The whole question was brought out the other day, before a large Meeting in the town of Bristol ; and there was a manifest assent to the fact, that the proofs then brought forward as to the nature of the Romish creed, as at present taught in Maynooth, fully justified the charge of Idolatry which is brought against it. On that ground we protest, with all our energies, against the nationalising of Idolatry, and the incorporating it into the institutions of the Country. Whatever may be thought by Lord Brougham, (who scoffed at the Wesleyan Methodists on the subject,) we believe that to incorporate Idolatry with the Established Institutions of the land would be, to bring down upon us the wrath of that jealous God, who can put down one Nation and exalt another ; and no scoffs, no taunts, no laughter of individuals, either in or out of the House of Commons, can turn us from that belief. (Cheers.) Now that I have stated the grounds on which we are opposed to the measure, just permit me to say, that the opposition is most hearty and most thorough. We are, Sir, opposed, as I have said, to any Grant whatever for the support of Popery. We are opposed to it from all the feelings of our hearts and consciences ; and we have gone already as far as it was right to go, in showing our opposition ; and we will go still as far as it is possible for citizens of this free Country to go, in the same direction. Sir, I will tell you what we have done. There have been no less than five large Meetings in the immediate neighbourhood of the town of Burslem. At several of these Meetings I was present. They were attended by Protestants of all denominations ; and more enthusiastic or more united Meetings it would be impossible to witness. In a large meeting held in the covered market-place of Burslem, there was but one hand held up against a Resolution which pledged us to withdraw all support from our present Members, if they continue to vote in favour of this measure. There was one hand held up in opposition to us ; but it was the hand of a stranger—a travelling

tailor. (Great laughter.) I attended a meeting also in the town of Leek. There also there was one hand held up in opposition to our proceedings. It was the hand of the Romish Priest of the place. (Hear, hear.) He came to the platform, and claimed a right to speak. That right was conceded to him. I put "PETER DENS" before him, and he ran out of the room. (Laughter.) But, Sir, we have not been satisfied with merely talking on the subject. We have sent up a petition from the town of Burslem, which was signed by many hundreds; and we have addressed a letter to our Misrepresentatives, Mr. Ricardo and Mr. Adderley, representing our feelings in reference to this matter. We declare to our Representatives, that we think they are not representing us justly and faithfully, according to the principles on which they were sent to Parliament; and, therefore, we shall make no scruple about it—we do not want them either to put up or to put down their money—(laughter)—but we tell them at once, like honest and plain-speaking men, that, as surely as another Election comes, they will not get a vote from us. I believe, also, that 700 County Voters have already signed a pledge to that effect. We are prepared to go still further; we are prepared to join in a Petition to the Throne. And if, after all, in spite of the almost unanimous opinion of this great Protestant Community,—if the advocates of our rights,—the men who were sent to Parliament upon the firm conviction that they were incapable of acceding to such a proposal as this,—if they shall still carry the measure through the two Houses of Parliament, and it shall become the law of the land, (which I trust, with God's blessing upon our efforts, it never will,) but *if it should*, why Sir, *then* we all become Repealers; and "Hurra for Repeal" will be our motto. (Loud cheers.) Sir Robert Peel, Sir, has taught us a lesson; he has taught us that there is nothing to be got by quiet, honest, loyal, faithful subjects. Which, I should like to know, of the Protestant Denominations has he proposed to do as much for, as he has proposed to do for this wretched system of Maynooth? (Hear, hear.) What has he done for those who, whilst differing from us on minor points, we yet admit to be good, faithful, Protestant subjects? What has he done, I should like to know, for the Members of the Free Church?—And has not that Church a higher and a much better claim upon him than the College of Maynooth? Sir, we will "agitate, agitate," till the next Election, and, as sure as there are Protestant Voters in the County of Stafford, our County Members must either vote against this Bill, or go out. Let them take their choice. Let it be our resolution, to form a solemn league and covenant, from which we will never cease, till we withdraw State support from Popery, on any plea, or under any pretence. (Cheers.)

The Rev. W. M'ILWAINE, from Belfast, in obedience to the call of the Chairman, rose to address the Meeting.—I cannot say that I am altogether unaccustomed to public speaking; but I may truly say, that I am entirely unaccustomed to such public speaking as this. And I may also declare, that I am very ill prepared for speaking at all. It is but a very few hours (about twenty-four) since I found myself at home. Up to twelve o'clock yesterday, I had not determined on coming to the Metropolis. But when I found that, if I did not come, the Protestant capital of Protestant Ulster would have no voice in this Conference, I said, "I will go, in God's Name." (Cheers.) Let me state to the Meeting, that I was anxious to put one fact on record, that



my Town—the Town of my affections and my Ministry—has been misrepresented in the Legislature. I have seen it stated in the public prints, on the authority of the Premier, that the respectability of the Town of Belfast is in favour of the Maynooth Grant. I say *it is not*, Sir. I stand here as the representative, I may say it without hesitation, of two classes of persons: and I think that, when I mention the names of both, you will agree with me, that there is at least some respectability connected with them. I stand here as the representative—however unworthy—and no one in this room feels his unworthiness or his inability more than I feel mine—of the Protestant Operative Association and Reformation Society of Belfast. That Society numbers hundreds, and I may say *thousands* of members; and, though I do not appear with a leathern apron myself, I still am, in heart and principle, a Protestant Operative. This body of men are opposed to the Grant. I also stand here, however unworthy, as the representative of all the Church of England Ministers in that Town. To a man, they are opposed to this Bill. I say, Sir, *to a man*. I believe they would rather go to the scaffold, if they were thought worthy of it, or be hung upon a lamp-post, than have either hand or part in passing, or helping forward, this iniquitous measure. Sir, I desire to set you and this Meeting right on the subject of the Petition, which was said to have come from the Town of Belfast. That Petition is represented to have been signed by about 400 persons, representing the respectability of the Town. It represents, Sir, a number of Radicals in politics. (Laughter.) I do not know what the name goes for *here*; but I know it is not much liked *in Ireland*. It was got up by a clique of Arians. It was hawked about in newsrooms. One of the most respectable inhabitants of Belfast was asked to put his hand to it, but he refused; and, notwithstanding what was said, I declare that the great bulk of the respectability of the Town of Belfast is opposed to that Petition. I would just say, with respect to the other party, which I have the onerous responsibility of representing, that all the Church of England men and Ministers disapprove of the proposed Grant to Maynooth. We, in Ireland, feel very strongly on the subject. I was summoned, a few weeks since, to the Town of Dingle; and there I witnessed a spectacle, which I will, at the hazard of trespassing on your attention for a few minutes, shortly relate. I saw 800 converts from the Church of Rome, who are now members of the Church of England. And what was the reward of the laborious Minister, my brother and friend Mr. Gayer, for his winning this glorious victory over the Church of Rome in its worst form? His reward was this:—When I saw him on the first evening after my arrival in the Town of Dingle, I found him secreted in his house. (Hear, hear.) He had not left his house for many weeks, satisfied that, if he did so, the knife or bullet would have been the consequence. The evidence, in relation to that affair, is now in process of being printed. It will show what is the real state of things where Popery prevails. The tiger may appear very quiet, when his claws are well cut: but the tiger in a cage, and the tiger in a jungle, are very different things; and thus Popery in England is a very different thing from Popery in Ireland. I saw on one occasion, ten men produced on a trial. There was a jury of six honest Roman Catholics. I am sure that Roman Catholics, if let alone, would be honest as well as other people. (Hear, hear.) I believe, Sir, that, if it were not for the poisoned

fountain of Maynooth, Ireland would be a very different Country from what it is. I believe, Sir, and I say it deliberately, that the root of Ireland's evils is to be found in that pestilential quarter. I saw these ten witnesses dragged on to a table like this; and every man of them perjured himself deliberately before he left that table. I saw this; and it came out in cross-examination, that they were trained by the Priests of Rome to give their evidence. I saw there one of the most loathsome specimens of humanity that I ever witnessed; a man who had been saved from starvation by the Protestant Clergyman of Dingle; a man fed for weeks and months by the bounty of Mr. Gayer. That man was brought to the table, and he received lessons as to his evidence from a Priest stationed by at the time. (This, Sir, is the sort of thing which is encouraged at Maynooth.) And when he had sworn, to the loathing of every respectable Roman Catholic present, he turned round to one of the Priests, and said to him in Irish, "Now, father, I have given them enough in English; I won't say another word but in Irish;" and he actually baffled the Judge and the Jury, by roaring out in Irish, until he had to be dragged, amidst the hisses of those present, from the table! This is on record. (Hear, hear.) These are the men whom Protestant England is to encourage. The whole of this scene dwells fresh upon my memory; and it was the direct emanation of that pest-house, Maynooth. Oh! that I were addressing England's Senators, instead of England's Ministers. But I take courage from the fact, that there is no man in this room who cannot influence thousands of his Countrymen. I do not speak the language of political excitement, but that of sobriety and reason; if one can be sober on such a subject. (Cheers.) Let it be remembered, what England once did for my native land. We got this present from you. It was you, in the time of your second Henry, that gave us the Roman Catholic Religion. Our Church was, till then, free from the influences of Romanism. The Church of Patrick and Columb and Aidan was a Protestant Church. It was England that gave us Popery; and let England take Popery back again; but, in God's Name, let not England defile her Throne and her Sanctuary, by attempting to fasten on the neck of Ireland what she cannot bear herself. Oh! let the Ministers present endeavour to influence their congregations. Let them stir them up, throughout the length and breadth of the land. Let the English lion arise, and shake his mane; and let him fling back again to his den this reckless tiger of Popery. But I tell you that, if Maynooth be endowed, that tiger will soon flesh his claws in the heart's blood of my Countrymen. (Cheers.)

The Rev. J. ALEXANDER, of Norwich, having been called on by the Chairman.—Norfolk has been the most zealous County in England in sending Petitions against this measure; and Norwich has been more hearty in the work than any other Town in Norfolk. We have had meetings in our City, composed of different classes of persons. The first Meeting was held by members of the Church of England; the next meeting was one composed of various classes of Dissenters; and the third was held by Churchmen and Dissenters united, in a room far larger than this, which contained more people than I had ever seen packed in that place, during the twenty-eight years that I had resided in that City. It was full in the inside, I know; and some persons said, it was full in the inside and on the outside, and on every side

besides. (Laughter.) The feeling was unanimous, and hearty, and the cheering most enthusiastic. Sir, we understand the question there. I wish some of our Leicester, and some of our London brethren would come to us. We would teach them that Churchmen and Dissenters can blend together on a question like this, and on a great many other questions, without the slightest degree either of compromise or disagreement. (Cheers.) I repeat it; we understand this question. We do not mean there to be told, that the measure is part of an original compact,—which has never been produced, and which could never be seen—excepting in the spirit. (Laughter.) We all know, that it is not a measure which will tend to the pacification of Ireland—the tub will not deceive the whale there. (Laughter.) We know it is not a measure of general education for the people; but a measure for the education of the Priesthood of the Roman Catholic Religion: and we know, too, that it is not a measure which is intended to stand alone, but it is the beginning of an end, which is to lead to the thorough establishment of Popery. (Hear, hear.) Churchmen and Dissenters have each had their own ground of opposition; but we have come, at last, to the same point; and that point is, a most uncompromising and, if you will, eternal objection to this measure. We have been led, in that Town, to think of the conduct of the Legislature; and most of us have come to the conclusion, that they had better leave these religious matters to those who understand religion better than themselves;—that, instead of putting a piece of new cloth into an old garment, they would act much more wisely, if they were to attend to their own business. I rejoice in being privileged to protest against this measure. I have rejoiced in the opportunity of being present this morning and this evening,—at a Meeting which exhibits the spectacle of the most cordial and entire union of Protestants. I trust, brethren, that the union is not to end here. We are united in our opposition to Popery: I trust most of us are united in love to Christ; and as, in connexion with the measure which has so often been referred to to-day,—we can unite together heartily and cordially, without any disagreement, and without any compromise of principle,—I do hope that this union will lead to another still more close and spiritual, in which men who hold one common faith, and who yield obedience and homage to one common Redeemer, will testify to the world and to the Church, that “one is our Master, even Christ.” (Cheers.)

The Rev. J. HARDING, Wesleyan Minister, of Grantham, having received permission to address the Meeting.—I have the honour of representing 2,500 Wesleyans in the town and neighbourhood of Grantham; and the Independent Congregations have also requested me to represent their feelings with reference to this measure. I feel quite unable to express the deep and united feeling which has been called forth in that part of the country. I am sure that Sir Robert Peel would have been astonished to witness what occurred among the quiet farmers of Lincolnshire,—even before any circular was received from the Central Committee in London. (Hear, hear.) It was more than I could do, to keep down the rising feeling of the farmers (and even some beneath the farmers) and the tradesmen of the Town. It was very difficult to prevent them from getting up petitions in a somewhat irregular manner; and to advise them to wait until the time had arrived, when we could unitedly co-operate for that purpose. Had a greater time elapsed before the petitions were

forwarded, I am persuaded that they would have received *five times as many signatures*. Many prayers are being offered to God in that part of the Country, as in many other districts ; and though a cloud does hang over us in the distance, blessed be the Name of the Great Master and Head of our common Protestant faith, that there is also a bow of different colours, harmonising the different sections of Protestant Christianity. We do feel, that that bow is a pledge, that the cloud will not be more dismal than we shall be able to bear.

The Rev. H. PADDON, Vicar of High Wycombe.—Mr. Chairman, I feel that, if I have any claim at all on your attention this evening, it is chiefly on a ground, that is exceedingly humiliating to me as a Minister of the Church of England—namely, that I see the Church so badly represented in this room to-night. (Cries of “No, no.”) Sir, I said this because I felt it ; if other gentlemen do not entertain the same feeling, that is a gratifying circumstance. I should have been glad to see, on the right hand of that good man and on his left, an Archbishop. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, I say this, not because I think that there is more good in a mitred head than in a head which is not mitred. A good man is a good man. I can give the right hand of fellowship to a brother Dissenter from the Church of England, as well as to a brother in the Church of England. But I do feel that the Church of England is not duly represented in this room to-day. As a Church of England Minister, I oppose this Grant, heart and soul. I feel that my Ordination Vow binds me to do so ; for, according to that, I am to oppose and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine ; and if erroneous doctrine is not in the Romish apostacy, where is it ? (Hear, hear.) I need only tell you further, that in compliance with the spirit of your Resolution, we held two Meetings in the Borough of High Wycombe, and they were marked by a most unanimous feeling ; and I assure you, that we are ready to assist, heart and hand, in all that you may determine to do.

The Rev. J. HAYDEN, Independent Minister, of High Wycombe.—I feel that it is quite unnecessary for me to add anything to what has just been said. I am happy that my brother, who has just spoken—the Clergyman of High Wycombe—has had the opportunity of addressing this Meeting. Let me only remark, that it is my humble conviction, that such a blow has not been struck, or rather attempted to be struck, at Protestantism, since the reign of Elizabeth, as that which is now attempted to be struck by the Prime Minister of this kingdom : and I do hope that every loyal subject, and every one who understands the principles of Protestantism, will do his very utmost to oppose the awful step which is about to be taken by her Majesty’s Government.

The Rev. Dr. COTTLE, Clergyman, from Taunton.—I have the honour to appear before you this evening, in connexion with my friends on the right and left, to represent “all who profess and call themselves Christians” in the Borough of Taunton. I represent especially the members of the Church of England, of my own congregation and other congregations in that place. My friend on the left is a Wesleyan, and the other gentleman is an Independent. I shall only state that, as regards this measure, an unanimous feeling of opposition to it pervades the whole Town of Taunton. I have a parish containing 8,019 souls ; and I think that, throughout the whole number, there are not more than twenty opponents to our movement. We have, in

fact, acted most cordially and unitedly in this matter. In few places, I believe, has more unanimity been exhibited. We first agreed to compromise our differences and feelings; that, if we must contend, we should only contend for "the faith once delivered to the saints." (Cheers.) Our good friend, Mr. Bull, spoke about ships. We, who reside in Taunton, have nailed our colours to the mast, and have inscribed thereon, "No peace with Rome." (Cheers.) Talk of the ship sinking! Gentlemen, we will not let her sink. (Cheers.) We will struggle with our difficulties; and we will never, at all events, let the vessel sink in the quicksands of Popery. (Cheers.)

The Rev. R. RAY, Wesleyan Minister, from Taunton.—There is one thing which I should like to state to the Conference, especially as the Gentleman from High Wycombe made the reference which he did to the Clergy of the Church. I am happy to be able to say, that the Rural Dean of our District called a Meeting of the Clergy of the Deanery on Saturday last. That Meeting was very numerously attended; and a very strong, but a very proper petition, emanated from it against the Maynooth Grant, which was signed by all the Clergymen present; and those who could not attend on that occasion, were to be visited on the Monday or Tuesday. I have the assurance of a Clergyman connected with the parish of St. James, that he entertained not the slightest doubt that the petition would be signed by nearly every Clergyman in that extensive Deanery.

The Rev. W. MOORE, from Truro.—I beg to state that I have been delegated to attend here by the Baptists, and the Wesleyan New Connexion, and by the Bible Christians of the town of Truro, who are in favour of your objects. A great impression has been produced on my mind by the circumstance, that, at the Meeting held on Monday night, just before I set off, I was proposed by a Wesleyan Minister, and seconded by a New Connexion Minister, for the office of their representative. This shows, I think, the unanimity of feeling which prevails among the different bodies. Our Meeting was a public demonstration, that we were all hearty and united in our objections to the measure. We hope and trust, that this Conference will be attended with such a powerful influence on the minds of Members of Parliament, as will really and truly disappoint the expectations of some of us as to the unfortunate result. I addressed the Meeting at Truro, with a full conviction, that I was quite at liberty to utter my own sentiments freely and fully. And I am happy to tell you, that my brethren of the Wesleyan denomination stated, that I might come up as a perfect Voluntary:—that they would not bind me to any particular sentiments, but at the same time they expected, that I should act on the ground of general opposition to Popery. I will not state my own peculiarities merely for the sake of expressing them; but I will only state that, as a Protestant Dissenting Minister, I wish to unite with all parties in their opposition to this measure.

J. BERRY, Esq., from Truro.—I have the honour to represent the Town of Truro on this occasion. I consider this Conference as an august representation of Protestant feeling in this Country. It is rather an unusual thing for Cornwall to send up Deputations to London; and I do not think it would have done so now, but for the contemptuous and disdainful manner in which the Prime Minister treated the Petition which we sent up. I have to regret

the absence on this occasion, of a gentleman of great influence, whom I expected, until Friday or Saturday night, to see in this Conference. Reference was made by a Deputy from Edinburgh this morning, to the conduct of certain Members who support this measure in Parliament. I feel bound to say, that one of our Representatives, Mr. Turner, has opposed the Maynooth Bill. Reference was also made, by the Rev. Mr. M'Neile, from Liverpool, to the conduct of the Protestant Operatives in that Town. Now I have reason to believe that the miners of Cornwall,—perhaps the most intelligent labouring population in this kingdom,—are almost unanimously opposed to this measure.

The Rev. J. T. ROBINSON, Rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn.—It was not my intention to intrude myself at all upon your notice this evening. I have been requested by some of my brethren around me to do so ; but at first I declined, in the present exhausted state of the Meeting,—I cannot say in the exhausted state of the subject ; for that is inexhaustible, as all subjects involving principle must be,—to trespass upon its attention. But,—as the Church of England has been referred to, by a reverend brother of mine, and as some lamentation has been expressed by him at the position in which the Church of England, in the person of its Ministers, stands in this room,—I rise for the purpose of conveying to you intelligence, which I am sure will be gratifying and encouraging, as proving that the Clergy of the Established Church are not altogether idle in this matter. I confess that some degree of reproach does attach to us, for our apathy and supineness hitherto ; but I hope that, with the blessing of God, the steps which are being taken will remove that reproach from us. I had my heart gladdened and cheered, and my hopes encouraged yesterday, by attending the Visitation of the Archdeacon of London, who, I am happy to inform you, delivered a Charge of the most eloquent, the most powerful, zealous, fervent, and argumentative character, in which he solely embraced the topic of the Endowment of Maynooth,—throwing into his opposition to it, all the influence of his station, together with all the talent which he undoubtedly possesses. Gentlemen, I hold in my hand an address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, which is in process of signature amongst the Clergy of London, stating that,—as we are convinced, alike on the grounds of Scripture and the Constitution, that the proposed Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth is dangerous to the peace and prosperity of this Empire, as well as contrary to the vow which we severally took at Ordination, to hold fast and to maintain the doctrines of Christianity, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures,—we trust that he, with the other Archbishops and the Bishops of this great Protestant Empire, will, within and without the Legislature, by all lawful means, oppose this most destructive and abominable measure. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, our excellent Chairman' has alluded to my having taken a prominent part in this movement. I beg to state on this occasion, that I have taken that part with the greatest satisfaction to my own feelings. I am happy to bear testimony to the courtesy, urbanity, kindness, and Christian charity, which I have met with from my Dissenting brethren in the Committee-room. Permit me to say, Gentlemen, as I have said before, that I have hitherto been a quiet man. I have preferred my study, and rigid and close attention to my parochial and other duties, to mixing in any affairs of this description. But I feel myself, as a citizen of this great Protestant country, and as a Clergyman—

of my own Church, betrayed by the power which ought to have encouraged and supported me. (Cheers.) I say, let those answer for it, who have made me—on the score of conscience, patriotism, and duty—an agitator in this holy cause; and I here devote whatever power, influence, or talent it may have pleased my God to have bestowed upon me, to this holy and righteous cause. I would conclude by quoting the words which were used by a Prince of the blood in the House of Lords,—the uncle of our Protestant Sovereign,—“God grant that he may recollect the principles,”—in allusion to his having been reared up in Protestant principles by his Royal Father; and he concluded by saying, and his declaration drew forth the acclamations of the Senators around him, and of all his Countrymen,—“I will maintain them, so help me God!” (Cheers.) Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I will only add one word, and I believe all will join me in it, and that one word is—“Amen!” (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—As the subject of the Church has been mentioned, I feel it my duty to state, that this Committee has thought right to communicate with the Archbishops, and with some of the Bishops; and that, in answer to their communications, some satisfactory replies have been received. (Loud cheers.) I am happy to say, that the Bishop of Exeter has turned the tables against many who were opposed to him in that Diocese. Many who were taking, as they supposed, the Protestant ground against the Bishop of Exeter, will find that they have changed places. I am sorry to say, that a Member for the County, whom I had the pleasure of meeting last night, and who *was* the opponent of the Bishop of Exeter, because he was doing what tended towards Popery, is now in favour of the Grant to Maynooth, to which the Bishop of Exeter is opposed. I am happy to tell you, on the best authority, that the Bishop of London is opposed to the Grant to Maynooth. (Cheers.) I am happy to tell you, on the best authority, that, although he is reported as likely to be the successor of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Lincoln is opposed to the Grant to Maynooth. The Bishop of Chester, with respect to whom there ought never to have been the slightest doubt, and the only doubt arose from a mistake of a reporter,—the Bishop of Chester is most decidedly opposed to the Grant to Maynooth. The Bishop of Winchester the same; and the Bishop of Ripon (from whom I received a letter last night) the same. I have great reason to hope, that a large proportion of the Bishops will do justice to the position which they occupy. (Cheers.)

The Rev. A. S. THELWALL.—I wish to mention one name, which it is peculiarly incumbent upon us to bear in mind. There is one Bishop, who has had the Christian kindness, and the strength of Christian principle, to come forward and meet us upon the Anti-Maynooth Committee:—I refer to the Bishop of Cashel. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—The Bishop of Cashel, I am happy to say, has been with us, and expressed himself in the strongest terms against the Maynooth Grant.

The amended Resolution, with respect to the contingent Address to her Majesty, was then brought up, and adopted by the Meeting.

The Rev. H. L. ADAMS, Independent Minister, from Newark.—I represent, not merely the different denominations in the Town of Newark, but the

whole Protestant population of that Town. Newark-upon-Trent is rather peculiarly situated, in consequence of Mr. Gladstone's having passed the gangway. (Laughter.) We have taken upon ourselves the responsibility of writing to our Members of Parliament, telling them, that we will spare them the expense of coming down again. (Laughter.) I am about to see the Duke of Newcastle to-morrow, as well as Lord Lincoln, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord John Manners. Mr. Gladstone wrote to me a most elaborate letter, to prove how it was, that he had changed his mind since he wrote his book; and I will not read that letter to you. Some of our friends, who are interested in the present question, said they could not understand it. (Laughter.) Mr. Gladstone came down to the Town a few weeks ago. I said to him, "Sir, I have read your book." "Dear me," said he, "I should think you are the first person in Newark who ever did so." "Well," I said, "there is one property in the book which I admired exceedingly." At that his countenance lighted up—and it is an exceedingly lovely countenance when he is pleased; and he said, "Pray what is it?" I replied, "Why, I think it can do no good; but then it will do very little harm, for hardly any one will ever understand it." (Laughter.) He took this observation exceedingly well. At nine o'clock to-morrow morning, we shall tell our Members that we are determined to return neither of them again; and we look to the Committee to point out to us suitable Protestant men, whom we may call upon in case of emergency. Mr. Gladstone is only waiting to be reappointed to office; and I believe that he left office with a view of giving unofficial support to the Maynooth Bill. I feel extremely anxious to ascertain whether our friends in London can suggest to us some faithful devoted man to supply his place. [A voice: "The Chairman."'] (Cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. REED.—Sir Culling is pre-engaged for the Tower Hamlets of London. (Laughter.)

The Rev. H. L. ADAMS.—I beg to dissent from that. I have written to Sir Culling, our Chairman, already; and I have his promise, that if Newark should be the first Borough where there is a vacancy, he will come and contest it; that is, if there is no other case which is more emergent.

The Conference then adjourned until twelve o'clock the following day.



### Third Sitting,

THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 1, 1845.

---

THE Conference resumed its sittings at twelve o'clock, when Sir CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, Bart., was again unanimously requested to occupy the Chair.

The Rev. J. ALEXANDER, of Norwich, opened the Meeting with prayer.

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, the public circumstances which have occurred since we parted company last night are of a most satisfactory character. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Gentlemen, this change of circumstances may produce some little modification of our plans; but I am quite sure that none of us will object to have our plans modified by such circumstances as those. (Laughter.) Gentlemen, I have the pleasure of informing you, or at least every individual present who was not before cognisant of the fact, that—owing to peculiar circumstances—the third reading of the Maynooth Bill does not come on in the House of Commons until the 19th of May. (Loud cheers.) Gentlemen, what may be the intention of those who have consented to that arrangement, it is not for me to say; and in the movements of public men at the present time it is often very difficult to know what their intentions are. But, Gentlemen, you look higher than man; you look to God; and, amid all the intrigues, and changes, and vacillations of Statesmen, you believe that they are but instruments in the hands of a mighty Ruler; and that every course, which they may think fit to pursue, is permissively appointed by God, for the good of His Church. (Hear, hear.) Looking at it, Gentlemen, in that light, I cannot but think that this delay is a most providential circumstance. It enables us to take our future steps, with that calmness, and with that arrangement, which becomes so great and so important a body as the present. It would seem to be highly probable, that this delay will just make all the difference; and that, having now three weeks to look forward to, ere the Third Reading comes on, we shall be enabled to take such steps with the House of Commons,—and to address ourselves in such a respectful and in such an influential manner to the House of Lords,—that this evil measure may be obviated. But, Gentlemen, my duty to-day is, rather to introduce

the subject than to go into the general question. We shall shortly return to the course of action which we pursued yesterday,—that of hearing statements from the Country. Having merely indicated *that* as what we shall proceed to presently, allow me just to refer to two or three topics which are very interesting. I have received a letter of a most encouraging character, from one who would probably have been with us, had not his age and infirmities prevented it—one who has long been an acute observer of the state of the Christian Church; one with whose entire sentiments we do not all of us agree; but yet whose character we all of us respect; I allude to the Rev. Dr. Chalmers. (Cheers.) I have received a letter of some length from him, bearing upon our present object. I was requested by the Anti-Maynooth Committee to write to him; and having done so, I have received an answer, which I am sure will cheer all your hearts. A publication has been sent to me, which I will do no more than mention—"The Continental Echo." But there is a letter addressed to myself (not personally, but as Chairman of the Anti-Maynooth Committee) which opens a very great subject—a subject which has been upon our own minds, and which will, I hope, be brought before you in the course of this day. The writers state that, from their connexion with the Continent, they have reason to know, that Protestants there are earnestly anxious for some great Protestant union. (Cheers.) I have also received letters from the United States,—not (I need not say) since the Anti-Maynooth Committee has been in existence, nor in consequence of our existence: but I have received from friends in the United States letters of the same purport; and it does seem to me, and it has seemed to the Committee, even before the question was directly brought before us, that this great Conference ought not to separate, without forming something like a permanent organisation for Protestant objects. (Cheers.) I, for one, do hope that,—whilst we look at home first, and endeavour to accomplish our object legitimately and effectually,—we shall also include in our organisation, our friends who are one with us throughout Christendom. Gentlemen, a Resolution was passed last night on the subject of an Address to the Queen. Now, it will be stated to you by others presently, as the opinion of the Committee, that this postponement of the Third Reading ought materially to modify our mode of action upon that subject. (Hear, hear.) We still entertain the opinions that we did; but we have felt, that it is desirable to bring the subject before you again; and, as we are exceedingly anxious that every step taken in connexion with this Conference should be taken with your full concurrence and approbation, I believe the whole of the proceedings relating to this night's meeting will be brought before us, as a preliminary step, this morning; and, in the course of an hour or two, you will be able to hear something about the proceedings this evening. Allow me to refer to one or two practical points in this morning's business. One is the meeting together of Deputations connected with particular Counties. The subject came up in a rather hurried manner last night; but, in spite of the hurried manner in which it was mentioned, I believe it did produce arrangements with regard to several Counties; and gentlemen connected with Counties did meet together this morning, and did take steps together for seeing their Members. I would suggest thus early in the Meeting, that any gentleman who has it in his mind, that influence might be

brought to bear on certain County Members, should, in the course of this day, converse with others from the same County; and, if he thinks fit, give notice to persons connected with that County, that, at a given hour on a given day, a particular Member will be waited upon; in order that all the influence of different localities may be concentrated. I merely mention this, in order that you may make business arrangements; and that the real sentiments of the Country may be brought out on the occasion. I proceed now to call upon gentlemen connected with particular places, to give us information. Let me again repeat two cautions. One is, that our friends will be short; another is, that they will, as far as possible, confine themselves to the statement of facts as to the state of feeling, and that they will not unnecessarily go into the general question. And, as I receive a great many applications, as Chairman, from those who wish to address the Conference, allow me to say, that I shall give the preference to those who, while they can make statements as to the feeling which exists in the Country, are also prepared to make statements as to interviews with Members of Parliament; because, I think this Conference should not look merely to the feeling in the Country; but also to what effect that feeling may be producing on the minds of Members of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) One gentleman's name has been given to me, who comes from Dublin. He has had a long conversation this morning with the Bishop of Cashel, who is in communication with the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The Rev. JOSEPH CALDWELL, of Dublin.—I merely wish to state one or two things. The Bishop, who goes heart and hand with us in everything that pertains to Protestant truth, begged me to remind this Meeting, that Ireland, after all, is the battle ground of Protestantism;—(hear, hear)—and that, if Popery is ever to get the ascendancy in our Constitution, it will be, by first gaining the ascendancy in Ireland. (Hear, hear.) So that if Sir Robert Peel looks towards “those little clouds which are rising in the west,” you too must be observant of any cloud that comes over Protestantism in that Island which lies to the west of you. He also begged me to state, that the Meeting should not lose sight of the importance of using any influence which the Deputations may have with the Episcopal Order in the House of Lords; and he further suggested, that not only the table, but the very floor of the House of Commons ought to be covered with Petitions against the Third Reading; and, now that the Third Reading is postponed until the 19th of May, you will have ample time for acting upon that suggestion. As I am on my legs, I beg to make one remark, with regard to the state of Protestantism in Ireland. Many of my brethren have asked me, why the Protestants of Ireland are not more alive to the importance of sending Petitions to Parliament against this measure. The fact is, that the poor Protestants of Ireland have been so discouraged and cast down, that they have almost given up the matter as a forlorn hope. They have done what they possibly could for the Constitution; they have not been supported as they ought to have been on this side of the Channel; and—now that “the powers that be” have done all they can to throw them overboard, and to raise Popery in Ireland—they really are so discouraged, that they can scarcely lift up their heads. (Hear, hear.) But, after this Meeting, Sir, I am sure there is not a man with a Protestant heart,

from Cape Clear to the Giant's Causeway, who will not put his hand to the work, and aid us in putting an end to this abominable attempt, which will, I trust, be crushed for ever. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—I will now call upon a Gentleman, who has had an interview with a Member of Parliament, and is prepared to state the result.

Mr. G. PAUL, of Stroud.—Sir, I have the honour to represent a large Anti-Maynooth Committee in Stroud. In accordance with the wish of the Chairman and of this Meeting, I went this morning, with my colleague, Mr. Backhouse, a minister of Stroud, or, at least, the neighbourhood, to call upon one of the Members who has voted with Government on this question. I am happy to inform you that, in deference to the strong opinions which we were authorised to lay before him, Mr. Scrope has given us his promise, that he will not vote with the Government again on this question. (Cheers.) We thought it right, when we first formed our Committee in Stroud, to write a letter both to the Borough and the County Members; and I will just read one paragraph of that letter, because I think you will find, if some of you have not already done this, that it contains a useful hint. "The Committee most readily recognise the right of their Borough Members to vote according to their best judgment on many questions that are brought forward; but they also believe, that a case may arise, like the present, when the religious feelings of all Protestant Denominations are outraged by a Bill before Parliament; and then it becomes the duty of the sitting Members to co-operate with the voters." This was the ground, upon which we considered ourselves justified, not in dictating to our Members, but in showing them, that there is a real ground on which voters may urge them, as we have done, and as we trust almost every one of you will do; that,—while we do not dictate to them,—a question may arise (as at the present time) when our Protestant interests are all at stake, and when we are justified in urging them, by every reason we can bring forward, to agree with us; and telling them plainly, that, if they do not vote against this Government measure, they must not expect to be returned again at the next Election. (Hear, hear.) We have also had a communication from one of our County Members, Mr. Codrington, Member for East Gloucestershire; and that too has been most satisfactory: he assures us, that he will certainly persevere in opposing this measure. The other Member for the County has also promised us, that he will not vote with the Government; that although he does approve, in many respects, of this measure, yet, in deference to the opinions of the Electors, he will not vote again with the Government. The other Borough Member, I am sorry to say, has written most decidedly, that, notwithstanding the opinions of the Electors, he intends to vote, in every stage of this measure, with the Government. And he has said this upon a very extraordinary ground. I will mention the ground, because I believe it is one that has been very commonly taken. He says that he shall vote with the Government—(this is Mr. Stanton, Member for Stroud)—he says he shall vote with the Government to endow this College, because he is in favour of Civil and Religious Liberty. (Laughter.) I will not detain you more than a few moments; but I will just read to you a paragraph of the letter, which we thought it right to send in reply to that statement. We say, "As advocates of Civil and Religious Liberty, we do not wish to subject a

Roman Catholic to any penalty for maintaining what we consider error ; but we think it our conscientious duty, to protest against that maudlin policy, that, under the specious plea of promoting Civil and Religious Liberty, would give Protestant money to carry out the treachery and tyranny of a College of Jesuits."

The CHAIRMAN announced that Deputies would now be heard from Derby.

The Rev. J. G. PIKE, Baptist Minister, of Derby.—Gentlemen, I shall endeavour to comply with the call of the Chairman, by stating, in a few words, the simple facts in reference to the efforts that have been made in Derby, in opposition to this most iniquitous project. I may observe, that I believe Derby was one of the first Towns that moved upon this subject. I rather think that the first Public Meeting in the Country was held there. We had a Meeting in that Town a month or five weeks ago,—an harmonious and numerous assembly of Bodies usually jarring on some points, but all uniting, on this occasion, in the common object. We had as speakers, Episcopalians, Wesleyans, Independents, and Baptists ;—and though I cannot say that, in reference to everything, there was a perfect unanimity of sentiment, I may say, that there was a perfect unanimity in opposing Popery ; and although, upon some points, a little difference of sentiment apparently existed,—that difference was expressed in the most friendly manner. (Hear, hear.) My estimable friend, Mr. Gawthorn, expressed his views as unfavourable to State Endowments generally ; but there was nothing of ill feeling, either felt or manifested in the Meeting, in consequence of that expression of sentiment. (Hear.) Another venerable gentleman, a Clergyman of the Establishment, expressed his views as to the advantages of Establishments ; but it was done in such a way, that there was nothing of unkind feeling. The Resolutions of the Meeting were strongly against the proposed Grant. A Town Petition was adopted ; but I do not know the exact amount of the signatures which it received. Congregational Petitions were also recommended. Several Congregational Petitions have been sent up, including Petitions from most, if not all, of the Nonconformist Denominations to which allusions have been made. In addition to that which I have mentioned, we have had several Meetings against the measure. One Meeting was most expressly a Nonconformist Meeting ; because the design of it was especially, to represent to our Members, (who owe their seats, in a great degree, to the Nonconformists of Derby,) the views of their constituents on that point. We had one Episcopalian gentleman with us ; but he accorded entirely with the course that we were adopting, in acting, in that particular case, distinctly. (Hear, hear.) In general, however, it may be said, that the most perfect harmony and uniformity of sentiment existed, in reference to our opposition to Popery. We had nothing like jarring. Instead of that, we unanimously opposed, and of course we continue to oppose, the Grant to Maynooth. Of course my statements refer to the religious portion of the population, Nonconformist and Episcopal. I am not aware of any difference among them upon this point—opposition to Popery, (Hear, hear.) And it was the Religious ground chiefly which was taken, both by Nonconformists and Episcopalians, in the public Meeting to which I have adverted. (Hear, hear.) I do not know, Sir, that it is needful for me to add anything to these statements. If I make one remark more—and I do not make it in

the way of complaint—it will be in allusion to an oversight which I observed yesterday. When the proposed list of the Secretaries to the Anti-Maynooth Conference was read over, I observed that, while there were Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Wesleyans, and Independents, there was no Baptist amongst the number. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. Dr. REED said,—I beg to propose, that the name of our friend Mr. Pike be added to the number of Secretaries.

The CHAIRMAN.—They were only appointed for each day.

A DEPUTY.—Still I think it would be desirable to have a Baptist Secretary; and I beg to move that our friend Mr. Stephens from Newport be appointed.

This motion having been seconded, was carried unanimously.

The Rev. W. VEVERS, Wesleyan Minister, from Derby, was called upon by the Chairman to address the Conference.—Although I most heartily confirm everything that has been said by my friend Mr. Pike, yet I must say, he has omitted to make any statement with respect to the interview we have had with our Members. I think it right to say, that, three weeks ago, the Rev. J. Gawthorn, Independent Minister, and myself, were sent up from Derby to London, to hold an interview with the Members for the Borough. We presented to them a strong Resolution, signed by all the Nonconformist Ministers in the Town, stating most distinctly, that, if they supported this Bill, we could not and would not support them at the next Election. I had an interview, at the same time, with Mr. Wm. Evans, Member for North Derbyshire, in company with Mr. Gawthorn; but all that we could obtain from him was, a promise that he would not vote for the Bill. I see he has voted in favour of Mr. Ward's Resolution. I had then an interview with Mr. Mundy, Member for South Derbyshire; and, although he is decidedly a Ministerial man, yet,—to his honour I state it,—he declared that he would vote, and he has voted, against the measure. (Cheers.) It is also right to state, in reference to Mr. Colville, the other Member for South Derbyshire, that, although he too is a decidedly Ministerial man, he has voted and will vote against the Government project. This morning, Mr. Brown, Mr. Pike, and myself, had a very long and faithful interview with Mr. Strutt, Member for the Town of Derby; and I think it will be no breach of confidence to state the substance of what occurred. We remonstrated with Mr. Strutt. We told him, most distinctly, that if he supported this Bill in future, as he had hitherto done, he would assuredly forfeit his seat, notwithstanding his great influence in the Town of Derby. Mr. Strutt treated us with great civility. He told us, that he must and would support the Bill, on the principles stated by the gentleman on my left—the principles of Civil and Religious Liberty; and he told us too, that, rather than vote against the measure, he would sacrifice his seat to-morrow. We also called at Lord Duncannon's; but it appeared that his Lordship was at Newmarket, I suppose attending to more important matters. (Laughter.) We had, however, a long interview with his Lordship's brother, who promised to make a faithful report to him of our statements. We have not seen either Mr. Colville or Mr. Mundy this morning; but, though they are decidedly opposed in politics to many parties in Derby who are against this Bill, this measure will, as I have stated, receive their opposition. Reference was made

yesterday, Sir, to the course pursued by the press in reference to this question. Now I think it right to state, that the Ministerial paper in Derby, the *Derby Mercury*, has come forward on this subject, and has opened its pages to any communications in opposition to this Bill. (Cheers.) The parties who conduct that paper are decidedly opposed to the Bill. I will now take the liberty of stating, that it was my privilege, and at the same time my mortification, to be in the House of Commons, when Sir Robert Peel moved the First Reading of the Maynooth Bill; and I hesitate not to denounce his speech on that occasion as a thoroughly Jesuitical speech. (Cheers.) If I had not known that Sir Robert Peel is a Protestant, I should have regarded him as a Jesuit, and as a decided advocate of Popery. It was my privilege, and my mortification too, to be in the House of Commons on the Second Reading of the Bill; and I heard the speech of that eminent statesman, the Right Hon. Wm. Gladstone, Member for Newark. (Hear, hear.) I heard also the cutting, sarcastic, and I think constitutional speech of Mr. D'Israeli. I will now tell you what I thought, during the time that I was listening to Mr. Gladstone's speech.—Mr. Gladstone is Member for Newark; my decided opinion is, that Mr. Gladstone left the Cabinet, merely that he might support this measure out of the Cabinet more efficiently than he could have done in it. (Hear, hear.) I apprehend that, at no distant period, Mr. Gladstone will be again in the Cabinet, if he can get into it. In that case, his seat must be vacated for Newark. Now I have taken an unwarrantable liberty. I have sent to my friend Mr. Adams, and to others, a recommendation, to organise, without delay, a determined opposition to Mr. Gladstone in the Town of Newark; and to bring forward as a Candidate a gentleman, who I think is entitled to the confidence and approbation of the whole Protestant constituency of this Country,—I mean our worthy Chairman. (Immense and long-continued applause.) I think it would be a glorious triumph of true Protestant principles, to put Sir Culling Eardley Smith against the Right Honourable William Gladstone; and I am quite certain, that our friends in Newark are prepared to carry you, Sir, with acclamation into the House of Commons. (Cheers.) But though I should feel exceedingly gratified, if you had the honour of defeating that eminent Protestant Statesman, (laughter,) the Right Honourable William Gladstone, yet, Sir, I think it is due to our Country, that the Protestant constituency should return you at the first possible period. (Hear, hear.) I think it would be a reproach to us, if there should be a seat vacant at any early period, which can be secured to the Protestants in any part of the Country, and they do not secure it for you; and, in case you should be returned, we shall hail you as the Protestant Representative of England, of Ireland, of Scotland, and of Wales. (Immense applause.) If I were not afraid of trespassing too much upon your time, I would read to you a letter which was put into my hands on Monday night by a magistrate of Derby, which he received from a friend—an Officer who has visited this celebrated College of Maynooth. (Cries of “Read.”) The letter is dated April 22, 1845. I am not at liberty to mention the name of the writer; but I pledge my character for the respectability of the Magistrate who put the letter into my hands, and he pledges his character for the respectability of the writer. He says, “It was curious enough halting at Maynooth, just at the time this Grant was making such a

stir. We went over the whole College. One of the Professors went all round, and was very civil in explaining everything; in fact, he was so extremely candid, and so communicative about the priests, and the influence they possess, and the means they resort to to obtain influence and money, that I half suspect he was a Jesuit, and deeper than he appeared to be, only he had such an extremely good countenance. (Laughter.) Nothing is commoner than for the Jesuits even to abuse the Roman Catholics and their religion, to make people think they do not care about it. There are 500 students; 250 are fed, clothed, and taught for nothing; and some of them have as much as £21 a-year, pocket money, besides: if the Grant passes, they are to have a much larger sum. The other 250 pay £20 a-year. It is a large building, or, rather, a series of buildings; they have a fine Library, Chapel, Dining-hall, &c., and every student has a particularly snug room, nicely furnished,—much better than barrack-rooms. We inspected the kitchen, and there were six immense spits, holding some dozens of saddles, legs, and shoulders of mutton and beef, all roasting, and a fellow making huge apple-pies. They allow fourteen pound of meat between eight students, nearly two pound a piece; (for people that profess to fast, a pretty tolerable allowance,—twice as much as a soldier is allowed); potatoes and bread *ad libitum*; cocoa, morning and night. They have no rules about fasting; it is—he said—left entirely to their own consciences,—which, I suspect, do not trouble them much when a leg of mutton is in the question. (Laughter.) They eat forty-five sheep a-week. The College furnishes sixty priests every year, ready cut and dried for any treason; quite enough, one would have thought, to be let loose upon this wretched Country. As they seem to flourish upon the £9000 a-year, they will live like fighting-cocks on £26,000. He said, he thought those Priests educated at Maynooth were ‘every taste in life entirely as loyal as the old Priests, who were educated in France, though they did join the Repale.’ He asked us to have wine and luncheon, but we returned to the inn.” Now as I partly promised the respectable Magistrate to whom I have referred, and who is heartily with us on this question, that I would read this communication to the Conference, I hope you will excuse me for having thus occupied your time. I shall return to Derby with my friends, determined, like them, to do all in my power to oppose this abominable measure.

The CHAIRMAN.—We shall now have the pleasure of listening to a Clergyman of the Metropolis, who, as Rector of St. George’s, Bloomsbury, possesses considerable influence in London.

The Hon. and Rev. H. M. VILLIERS.—Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, I have certainly been introduced to this Meeting in terms which I little expected; for, although a resident in London, my occupations have been such, that I have had but little opportunity of gathering the general opinion of those around me upon this subject. I certainly felt it my duty, however, to acquaint myself with the feelings of those who are really interested in the matter, because they are interested in the honour of their Redeemer; and I can truly say, that I cannot understand how any one who has any regard for the honour of that Redeemer, who attaches any value to the Word of God, or who has any desire to see the salvation of souls and the extension of Christ’s kingdom, can have any doubt as to the part which he ought to take in reference to this question.



(Hear.) I have heard it regretted, Sir, that there are so few of my brethren, the Clergy of London, present at this Conference. I do not myself believe, however, that there is in reality any want of feeling on this subject. (Hear, hear.) I regret that there may be circumstances, or prejudices, or old feelings, which may prevent them from coming forward and openly stating, that, as there is an enemy at our door which must be resisted by Christians of all classes, whatever their uniform,—as there is a victory to be gained under the great Captain of our salvation,—they feel that they ought to join in the struggle, and go forward to the triumph. (Cheers.) Permit me to say, that very early in life—from the moment when I entered the Ministry—I determined to lay aside political feelings; I resolved, that nothing should induce me to risk my Ministerial usefulness, by taking a prominent part in the political warfare of the day. (Hear, hear.) But that, Sir, does not prevent me from having my own feelings and sentiments in reference to this matter. (Hear, hear.) I conceive, that we are not met together to discuss political subjects;—we are not assembled, for instance, to talk of Free Trade and other matters of that kind; but of the honour of that God, who is the God of all trade, and without whom no trade can flourish, either in this or in any other Country. I feel that I am standing here entirely on a religious question; and that I am bound, as a Christian Minister, to bear my testimony against Anti-Christ, in whatever shape. I do not intend to allow myself, for one moment, to enter into any personalities, either connected with those in power or those out of power. (Hear, hear.) I do not intend to allow my tongue to run wild, or to use hard names concerning any man. We are met here for a holier, and a more solemn object; and I feel that our hearts ought, not indeed, to be laid low with fear, but to be humbled to the dust, that in this Protestant land there should be again any attempt to rebuild that Popery, which was cast down somewhat, though not altogether, at the time of our glorious Reformation. (Cheers.) I feel, that those who are called upon to speak on these occasions, are bound to speak, not seeking the applause of man, but that honour which comes from God alone;—(hear, hear)—that they should come here in the spirit of prayer, and keep up and manifest that spirit in the whole of their language and conversation. I have come here this day from the house of prayer; and I trust, that it is in the spirit of prayer that I am addressing you. I feel that our strength in this matter is not in our Deputations, though we may honour and respect them, and rejoice in their presence;—and our strength depends not on the speakers at this Conference. We are looking for a higher strength; we are looking up to Him who is emphatically “mighty to save.” I cordially respond to the hopeful language which has been used in this Meeting. For myself, I am not ashamed to own, that I believe that, as a Conference, the very hairs of our heads are numbered, and I look, Sir, upon the delay of the Third Reading of this Bill as, indeed, the work of Providence. (Hear, hear.) Who amongst us, Sir, that has come here, acknowledging that this is a religious subject alone, will venture to deny that this has happened in answer to prayer? Sir, I am not one who is afraid of being laughed at, because there may be some who, on hearing that there are Scriptural arguments against this measure, turn aside with a sneer and say, “These arguments are not such as we shall condescend to answer.” (Hear.) Sir, it is,

not because they will not condescend, but because they are unable, to answer these objections, that they pursue such a course. (Hear, hear.) They tell us, that they will not refer to the Apocalypse or the Book of Daniel. Very well, supposing that to be a good argument, though I deny that it is so, what is their position then? I look at the language of the Apostle Paul; and I find, that he is no less emphatic concerning "the man of sin." (Hear, hear.) Therefore I meet them on their own ground; for I suppose they will all admit, that he was the Apostle of the Gentiles; and, if so, they must acknowledge the truth of his words. Sir, I do not see how any man can look at various passages in the writings of that Apostle, and not see that Anti-Christ, in the shape of Popery, is described in the words of the Apostle. Therefore, believing Popery to be intended by "the man of sin," I desire not to be the servant of sin, I desire not to acknowledge sin, but I am determined boldly and openly to make my protest against it. I do feel, as much as any man in this room, the importance of Civil and Religious Liberty. But I envy not that patient, who sends for his medical man, and, on his arrival, says to him, "I am near to death; and therefore give me a quietus at once;" and I envy not that man, who, at the risk of his own life, yields to such a request. And thus, when I hear a Minister of the Crown speaking of "religious consolations," and expressing an opinion, that every man should have "religious consolations" provided for him according to his religious faith and principles, I feel, that such an one is just acting in accordance with the character which he laid down for himself, the character of a medical man; only that he is endeavouring to satisfy his patients, by giving them a quietus of deadly poison. (Hear, hear.) I will not yield to any man on a question of Civil and Religious Liberty. But I look to Him whose service is perfect freedom; I look to Him, who has set His own Zion free from the trammels of legal bondage; and I cannot and will not, either directly or indirectly, be a party to the bringing back of any into that worse than Egyptian bondage—the bondage of Popery. (Cheers.) I will not trespass any longer upon your time in reference to this matter. Let me, however, in conclusion, give one word of exhortation to all present. Let it be the earnest desire of every one, not to use hard names. The grounds upon which we are met are too good to require that. (Hear.) On the other hand, let us not be afraid of being called hard names; but let our feeling be that which has called us together, and our determination to persevere in our opposition to Popery. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, as I passed through Exeter on Tuesday morning, after giving myself a little vacation, I saw placarded on the walls an intimation, that a Meeting was to be held there on Tuesday night. Understanding that there is a gentleman in the room, who was present at that Meeting, I beg to call upon him to address us.

A DEPUTY.—He is not present now.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Rev. Mr. Paddon, Vicar of High Wycombe, having seen a Member of Parliament this morning, I beg to call upon that gentleman to address the Conference.

The Rev. H. PADDON.—Sir, I could not hear the speech of my reverend brother, Mr. Villiers, without thinking of one passage in the word of God. It is this, "Not many rich, not many noble, not many mighty are called."

Thank God, I would say, with Lady Huntingdon, for the letter M. In coming before you, to give an account of the interview which I have had with our Borough Member, I feel it necessary to say something for myself, that I may stand fair with my people; and for this reason, that, when I went to the Borough of High Wycombe,—I went to it as the Curate, and I am now the Vicar,—I took a similar resolution to that of Mr. Villiers. I determined, for the sake of my ministry, not to register my vote. Politics run high there, as in many other places; and I saw that I must necessarily become a party man, and therefore, for the sake of my ministry, I came to the determination which I have mentioned. Now, Sir, because of this, some may say, that I was out of my place in accepting, in conjunction with the Rev. Mr. Hayden, Independent Minister of High Wycombe, the office of a Deputation to our Borough Member. Let me, therefore, state, that I view this, not as a political question, but simply as a religious question. (Hear, hear.) I come here as a Minister of the Church of England, who is bound by his Ordination Vow as such, to help to drive away erroneous and strange doctrine; and in no other light do I appear in this Meeting. (Hear, hear.) Now I have just put down the substance of what passed this morning; and I call upon Mr. Hayden to correct me, if there should be any mistake. We went to Captain Bernal Osborne this morning. He received us very kindly; and I stated to him the object of our visit. He entered upon the subject. He said he was favourable to the Bill. He said, “You’ll lose Ireland, if you don’t pass this Bill.” I told him, I thought we ought not to do evil that good might come. He did not like to enter upon the religious view of the question at all; indeed he declined doing it. I then told him of the large Meetings we had had at Wycombe; I told him of the feelings manifested in this room yesterday; and I said, that I wished he could have witnessed them. I asked him then, Whether he would give this abominable measure his unqualified opposition? His answer was this:—“I cannot engage to give it unqualified opposition.” I thought that was a step gained. He said, moreover, “In deference to the sentiments of my Constituents, I have abstained from voting both on the First and Second Reading of the Bill.” I then, after a little more conversation, said to him, that I should return to this Meeting to-day. I was not quite certain, whether it was at this Meeting, or at the Meeting at Exeter Hall this evening, that we Deputies should have to give our statement; but, whichever it was, I said, I hoped he would allow me, and I was sure it would give his Constituents the greatest pleasure if he did, to state, that he would give it his opposition; and he said, in answer to this, “I will not pledge myself; I will write to you.” On leaving Captain Osborne, I said, “I hope you will allow me to go to the Meeting and say thus much, that I have great reason to be satisfied with the interview we have had.” He assented. (Cheers.)

The Rev. J. GEDEN, Wesleyan Minister, of Wolverhampton, being called upon by the Chairman, stated, that,—accompanied by the other members of the Deputation from the Town of Wolverhampton, representing the Wesleyans of that Township, and the Rev. Mr. Guest, representative of the Independent Congregation at Bilston in that Township, he had called on the Honourable Mr. Villiers; but had not had the opportunity of meeting him, or making any appointment with him.

The CHAIRMAN.—The gentleman of that name, who represents Wolverhampton, is the brother of the Rev. Mr. Villiers who has just addressed us.

The Rev. J. GEDEN.—We have, however, seen Thomas Thornely, Esq., the other Representative; and I am bound to say, that he received us with great courtesy. He stated, that he felt an objection to our view of the case, because the Grant to Maynooth had been continued for half-a-century,—five years before the Union, and forty-five years since the Union. I felt, Sir Culling, bound to state to him, that, in several communications which I had seen from honourable Members of the House of Commons, there appeared to be a little mistake. They had referred to this measure, merely as an increase of the Grant to Maynooth. I said that, if it had been merely an increase of that Grant, there would not have been all this stir about it. There had been a general impression, that we were under some sort of compact, and it is very likely that that impression would have remained; but when Sir Robert Peel brought in a Bill for the Endowment of the College of Maynooth, the subject was examined, and that impression was removed. I stated, that one great objection to this measure was, that it introduced the principle of the Endowment of Popery; and that, when the Principle was once introduced, we did not know how far it might be carried. In reply to that he said, he thought we had no reason to be at all apprehensive; he thought the feeling of this Country was so general against the Endowment of Maynooth—the feeling of this Country had been so strongly expressed on that subject—(laughter)—that any further Endowment was not at all to be dreaded. I reminded him, that Lord John Russell had signified his desire for the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Priesthood; that Sir James Graham and Sir Robert Peel had both stated, that they saw no religious objection to such Endowment: and that we really apprehended, that there was great danger, if the principle were once introduced; and we wished, therefore, to prevent the introduction of the principle. After some further conversation, I said, I felt a difficulty, as one of the Members of the Deputation, in asking a Member who had voted for the First and Second Reading of the Bill, to vote against the Third Reading; but I thought that, though there was a little difficulty involved, there was a path out of the difficulty for gentlemen who sat on his side of the House. It might very well be supposed, I said, that many of them voted for the Second Reading, hoping that Mr. Ward would succeed with his Amendment; but, as he had not done so, they might change their vote, without any dishonour to themselves, on the Third Reading. He stated, that he was sorry to say, that he could not promise to do so. I then said that, before we left him, we should like, if possible, if that favour could not be granted, to ask another favour—a lesser one; and that was, that he would withhold his vote on the Third Reading; that he would not vote at all. He stated that he would give the subject his most grave consideration; but he could not engage so to do, nor give us any reason to think, that he should withhold his vote on the Third Reading. I deemed it my duty, Sir Culling, to state, on leaving him, that the feeling on this subject was so intense, so deeply founded in religious principle, and so exceedingly strong, in the Township of Wolverhampton, that it was not likely to be forgotten, even if an Election should not take place for the next two years. (Hear, hear.) He appeared to feel that, and he said, “Why, as for that, we

must understand each other when such a period arrives ; it may be very soon, and it may not be for two years." Thus, Sir, we were obliged to leave the matter.

The Rev. W. VEVERS.—Would you allow me to speak, Sir, for one moment? I beg just to state that, in the interview with Mr. Strutt, we told him, that though we could scarcely expect that he would vote against the Bill, after having voted twice for it; yet that, in consequence of Sir Robert Peel's having refused an interview to this Conference, he might honourably take that ground; and he ought to take it, as an advocate of the liberties of the people. I think Sir Robert Peel has greatly insulted the whole Protestant Constituency of this Country; and that any Member of Parliament may, on that ground, now vote against the Bill. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. ROBERT BEW, of Bilston.—As a member of the Deputation from Wolverhampton, I am anxious to add a word or two to what has already been said. The Township of Bilston is one of four Towns which form the Borough of Wolverhampton,—containing a population of eighty or ninety thousand persons; and we do not, therefore, consider our Borough a very insignificant one. I came up with feelings of great regret,—having unfortunately to differ from our Representatives with respect to this measure; and I feel now encouraged to seek an interview with the Hon. Charles Pelham Villiers, by what has fallen from his brother. I can only state, that the feeling in the Borough of Wolverhampton is more united, and more intense, on this subject, than I have ever known it to be on any one subject for many years. I stand here as the representative of the Wesleyan Society of Bilston; but I have the pleasure of stating, that other bodies of Christians in that Town are actuated by the same feelings. The Church party have sent up a petition numerously signed. Although we have not succeeded with our Representative, Mr. Thornely, with whom we had the honour of an interview this morning,—we have, I believe, produced a greater impression upon him than had been made before; and I have the pleasure of informing you, that the Hon. Charles Pelham Villiers, in a letter which I received from him before I came to London, stated that there was no subject on which he had felt so much doubt as he did upon this. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. A. M. BROWN, from Cheltenham.—I felt sorry, when the name of Cheltenham was mentioned yesterday, that there was no representative of the Clergy of so important a Town. I had fully anticipated, that the Reverend Incumbent of Cheltenham, who is a warm-hearted, wise, and determined opponent of this measure, would have been present to represent the whole of his parishioners;—but as that gentleman is not here, I beg to say, that I stand here on behalf of the Association of Congregational Ministers in Gloucestershire, and also of a large number of persons connected with Highbury Chapel, Cheltenham,—in fact, I may say, the whole congregation worshipping in that place. I beg further to inform the Meeting, that I came here, under these peculiar circumstances:—I was not pledged at all to join this Conference, unless I saw that the spirit of the proceedings was such as I could fully approve. (Hear, hear.) I rejoice to say that, although I have watched the spirit of the Meeting with the greatest jealousy, I have felt throughout

exceedingly delighted. (Hear, hear.) Permit me to say, in reference to the letter which has been read to the Meeting, that we are come here for no purpose except that of opposing Popery, and preventing it from receiving anything for its support from our pockets. I, for one, should rejoice to see those Students who have been referred to well lodged; but let them not be lodged at our expense. I am, I may say, deputed by the Hon. Craven Berkeley, to make a statement. He is not one of those Members of Parliament who laugh at such a Meeting as this: but he expressed to me his own respect for the assembly, his great respect for it, and he begged me to state this to you. I met Mr. Berkeley this morning, according to appointment. Let me say, that the Honourable Gentleman has supported this measure, both on the First and on the Second Reading; and that he holds the principle of an Established Church, or rather of endowing Religion, on this ground, that all parties should be endowed. I now speak his sentiments. He supported Mr. Ward's motion, because he was anxious, that the amount to be handed over by Sir Robert Peel, through this measure, to Maynooth, should come from the funds of the Established Church in Ireland; but, that motion having been lost, he declared to me this morning, Sir Culling, that he is determined now to give his opposition to the Bill in every future stage. (Cheers.) I asked him, whether we might also expect Earl Fitzhardinge to do the same, in the event of his presenting our petition to the House of Lords. His answer was, "I am not authorised to say, that Earl Fitzhardinge will oppose the measure in the House of Lords; but, at the same time, it is my conviction, that he will oppose it every stage." I bring also from the County Association of Gloucester, an Address to the Queen, in the event of its passing the Commons and the Lords, requesting that the Queen, our Protestant Queen, will immediately dissolve the House of Commons; and I believe it goes so far also as to pray, that she would send adrift the present Ministry. (Laughter.)

J. BACON, Esq., from Exeter.—Gentlemen, I should have been glad to be excused from being placed in this very prominent position; for it seems as if a man had something to say, when he is put forward in this way. Will you allow me to apologise for myself, by mentioning the circumstances in which I am placed? Having been in the Metropolis now for a considerable time, the Committee in Exeter requested me to form part of a Deputation to this Conference. I have been looking round for my colleague, in order to obtain information, and to learn what has been passing; and I have not been able to find him. (Laughter.) In reference to what has been done in Exeter, let me however say, that we came to the point at once. Petitions were talked of. Very well, let us petition; but let us look back, and see what petitions have produced. Respectful representations to our Legislature are, I am sorry to say, disregarded to a very great extent. And why is this? If we may pay ourselves a compliment, I should say, the reason is, that we are quiet, decent, and respectable people. If we could say, as the Papists do, "If you don't do so and so, we will break your bones," it would be altogether another question. But we mean no such thing; and therefore we cannot say it. Well, Gentlemen, as I said, we came to the point at once. We said, "We will have no more trifling with Petitions. If they are prepared, we shall be glad to sign any that other people bring us; but we will come to the point at once."

I had myself the pleasure of perusing that written document, which was sent to our Representatives and the Representatives of the County,—stating, agreeably to the sentiments which have been delivered in this Meeting, that however we might personally respect them, yet if they should vote for this measure, they would never have our support again. And, Gentlemen, though we hung fire a little for a time, the result has been, that we have obtained the names of more than 250 voters, who have entered into this compact, and made this representation; and a great many Gentlemen, I have the pleasure to say, have communicated to us the same intention. Though they did not feel compelled to put their names on paper, and thus restrict the conduct of their Members. They have said, “If they do support the Bill, we will never vote for them again.” I had the pleasure of sending up these documents to all the Members, according to the instruction of the Committee. So far as this, Gentlemen, I can make a statement to you, of what we have done in Exeter; but unfortunately I cannot tell you, that I and my colleague have waited upon the Members in London; for, in fact, I cannot find my colleague. (Laughter.) I beg to assure you that I feel myself too old to take any pleasure in coming forward to take an active part in public affairs,—except when called upon to do so by my conscientious convictions. (Hear, hear.) Then, indeed, I cannot hesitate to come forward, and raise my voice in the cause of truth. I was thinking, when allusions were made to the Church of England, that it may be supposed from my appearing here this morning, that I am a very low Churchman. (Laughter.) I can assure you, Sir, that I am a very high Churchman. My Churchmanship mounts up above the clouds; and there is no weathercock at the top of the spire. (Laughter.) Gentlemen, as an individual Christian, I will allow no one to crown that spire, but Him who condescended to allow Himself to be placed on the pinnacle of the temple. (Cheers.) I know we shall be considered very weak, and very silly, for what we are purposing and doing. We are told, that all the talents are against us. For myself, I must say, that I wish to possess, not those talents which are the most brilliant, but those which are the most useful to mankind. (Hear, hear.) And I beg to say further, that I think there is a temptation when a man possesses very great and ingenious talents, to take the wrong side; because he can then say, “You see how, with my talent and ingenuity, I can make black appear to be white.” (Laughter.) Gentlemen, we are also told, that we have got the wisdom of Parliament against us. Parliament, in its wisdom, is determining this and the other; but ah! there is One who bringeth to nought the wisdom of the wise. Hence I have often wondered, that Gentlemen belonging to that assembly are so incautious as to use the words, “wisdom of Parliament;” for it puts one in mind of their want of wisdom. The wisdom of Parliament in one year, is obliged to be revoked by the wisdom of Parliament in the next year. Gentlemen, I do rejoice in what you are doing, and in understanding that there is a good hope for us. I do acknowledge, that I have been a little on the desponding side of our question; but now my thermometer has risen fifty degrees. (Laughter.) May God give to our Senators wisdom! but may He, at the same time, give them Grace, that they may apply to that Wisdom which alone can direct them! Having now obeyed the call which was made upon me, I will retire, expressing my

earnest hope that, in future Elections, we shall not, as hitherto, suffer merely inferior questions, and party purposes and objects, to influence our votes. I do hope, that in future, we shall find religious questions—the grand question of defending our Protestant principles,—purchased for us, as they have been, by the blood and torments of our forefathers,—the great desideratum when we are again asked for our votes.

The CHAIRMAN.—I will now proceed to call upon gentlemen connected with the West Riding of Yorkshire.

The Rev. A. EWING, from Halifax.—Mr. Suter represents the Wesleyan body, Mr. Dunn, the Baptists, and I represent the Independents. There is also another gentleman, who represents the members of the Established Church, or at least one of the Churches,—St. James's, Halifax. We have formed an Anti-Maynooth Committee there. But, previous to that, the Dis-senters of Halifax had taken an opportunity of writing to their Members, Mr. Protheroe and Mr. Charles Wood. We found that Mr. Protheroe was with us in opposition to the Bill; but I am sorry to say, that we have not been able, by all our argument, and all our correspondence, severally and jointly, to prevail on Mr. Charles Wood to assure us, that he will oppose the measure. At the same time, he has not voted at all on the First and Second Reading. I think he has voted for the motion of Mr. Ward. Although we feel strong in public opinion, as regards the religious part of the community, we ought to be aware, that we have a very powerful opposition on the ground of what is called Liberalism;—I call it pseudo-Liberalism. I do know, however, that in Halifax and other parts of Yorkshire, there are very many, who, although we may smile at it, support this Grant on the ground of Civil and Religious Liberty. I believe this is the case with Mr. Charles Wood; and he says it is very strange indeed, that we—the part of the community who have always been forward in advocating the principles of Civil and Religious Liberty—do not feel in the same way as himself. I stand here representing three numerous Congregations in Halifax, of the Independent Denomination. We are all one with our brethren, the Baptists and the Wesleyans, in opposition to this measure,—although we take our several grounds, and are not ashamed conscientiously to advocate the grounds we do take. The Independents and Baptists take the Voluntary Principle as one ground; and the Wesleyans, of course, will state the ground on which *they* oppose the measure. I am happy to say, that the Evangelical party and Ministers in the Church are decidedly opposed to the measure. So that the opposition there is general amongst the religious body.

The Rev. Mr. STAINFORTH, Vicar of Pontefract, was called upon by the Chairman.—The most interesting part of my statement refers to the interview we had this morning with the Honourable Mr. Wortley. The Deputation to him consisted of gentlemen from Leeds, Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield, and Sowerby Bridge. The Honourable Gentleman received us most kindly. We told him, that a most extensive feeling of opposition to the Bill prevailed in our respective neighbourhoods. He answered, that he was aware that a great number of his constituents differed from him in opinion with regard to the Bill in question; but, he said, his own mind was made up, and he could not alter the views which he had expressed in his speech in Parliament. He



added, that not only he, but the Prime Minister also, was aware of the strong and general feeling of opposition which prevailed against the Bill throughout the Country: though, he said, he did not think the feeling was universal. He thought there were places, where the inhabitants were in favour of the measure. He added also the important observation, that no one knew what course the Prime Minister would take. I was glad to hear him say, that he thought in no place in the West Riding was the feeling of opposition to the Bill stronger than in Pontefract. Let me just state to the Meeting, what has been done in that Town. As soon as the Bill was introduced, we held a Meeting in the Town Hall, at which the Mayor of Pontefract, who is a member of the Deputation, took the chair; and the Clergy and Ministers of all Denominations attended, and expressed themselves in opposition to the Bill. The consequence of this Meeting was, that a petition was drawn up, which has been more numerously signed than any that I ever saw got up in Pontefract, during the forty years that I have been connected with it. The Committee who called together this Meeting, afterwards drew up a declaration, to the effect, that the undersigned, in case the Bill in question passed into a law, would, at the ensuing Parliamentary Election, oppose any Candidate who had helped forward the Maynooth Bill, or who would not pledge himself to vote in Parliament in defence of the Protestant principles of the Constitution. Within the last fortnight, we have held a second Meeting, at which we agreed to a Petition to the House of Lords, and also to her Majesty; but this latter Petition was not to be presented, until the Bill had passed the House of Commons. Not only does the most fervent zeal prevail in Pontefract against this measure, but there is also the most perfect unanimity. And I believe that both the zeal and the unanimity will be maintained, as long as the Protestant Principles of our Constitution are in danger.

Mr. ALEX. G. SUTER, from Halifax, was called upon, to state the result of the interview with the Members for the West Riding of Yorkshire.—I went, in company with the Reverend Gentleman who has just addressed the Meeting, and a Deputation of fifteen, to wait this morning upon the Honourable John Stuart Wortley. We also called at the house of Mr. E. B. Denison, who was not at home. With Mr. Wortley we had a very long interview; but I am sorry to say that we could not produce the effect we wished. A fortnight ago, I wrote a letter, on my individual responsibility, to Mr. Wortley. I stated that, having been one of those who assisted to place him in his position as Representative of Yorkshire, I took the liberty of saying, that I differed with him in reference to the Maynooth question; and that I, and a large number of that majority, had come to the conclusion, that if he thought it consistent with the pledge which he had given to his constituents,—whose interests, amongst other duties, he was sent to Parliament to represent,—and voted on the Third Reading of the Bill for the Maynooth Grant, we should think it our duty to withhold our votes from him at the next Election. I had a very civil and courteous letter in reply; but, to my surprise, the substance of it was what has been stated to the Deputation this morning. Mr. Wortley said, he was pained at finding, that he differed from his constituents on this question; but that the course which he was now pursuing was in perfect accordance with his previous political life. He said, he would not consent to go to Par-

liament shackled and fettered. I took the liberty of asking him, in the interview, if he thought that any Member had been sent to the House more perfectly unfettered and unshackled than himself? but, I said, I did think he should yield, on a question of this importance and magnitude, when requested to do so by all parties;—that there were gentlemen—from whom, on secular politics, I differed—constituting part of the Deputation; and that we had all agreed, that this one question should be the healing salt; and that, whatever became of politics, we would resist this measure. (Cheers.) Another member of the Deputation, Alfred Harris, Esq., told him, that he and all who advocated this measure were labouring under a great mistake, in supposing that the dissatisfaction which prevailed in reference to it was only partial: I said it was all but general. Although Halifax itself, as my friend, Mr. Ewing, intimated to the Meeting, has not been unvisited by the spirit of faction, I am happy to say, that this measure has had the effect of combining leading men,—amongst whom there is a considerable difference of opinion on minor points,—in the great principle of upholding Scriptural Christianity.

The Rev. T. POWELL, Wesleyan Minister, from Doncaster.—I merely wish, Sir, to make one remark, namely, that Mr. E. B. Denison is with us on this question. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. W. NAYLOR, Wesleyan Minister, from Bradford.—I beg to state, that we have also waited this morning upon Mr. Busfield; and I wish to mention an important circumstance, in connexion with our interview. Some individual had been to Mr. Busfield before ourselves, and told him, that the feeling in opposition to the Bill, in Bradford, was not so general as we represented. (Hear, hear.) This, in a great measure, neutralised our influence. We thought it right to state, that that person, whose name I will not here mention, had not given a fair representation of the feeling which exists in Bradford. I recommend others to take care, that their influence is not neutralised in the same manner, by some intervening party.

Mr. W. WILLANS, of Huddersfield, was called upon by the Chairman.—I do not know, Sir, why I should receive this call, when there are two Ministers and a County Magistrate, each of whom is better qualified to perform the required task than myself.

The Rev. J. GREAVES, Wesleyan Minister, from Huddersfield.—I merely wish to say, Sir Culling, that the Conference has been addressed by so many Ministers on this occasion, that when there is a talented layman present, who has acquitted himself so admirably as Mr. Willans has done, he ought to be called upon to state what has occurred. (Cheers.)

Mr. W. WILLANS, on again rising, said,—I will state to you a fact. I have addressed six letters to our Representative, and I have not yet been able to make him comprehend the question. (Laughter.) From some confusion in *his* ideas, or some want of perspicuity in *my* mode of expression,—though upon all other subjects a most intelligent man,—he seems entirely unable to understand what we mean by this opposition. And it happens, unfortunately, that he is in the very same predicament with respect to me; for I have had five letters from him, and I have not been able to comprehend his arguments. (Laughter.) Despairing, I suppose, of making me understand his own views, he has sent me a large volume entitled, “*Past and Present Policy*

with respect to Ireland ;” but I have not got much further. He received us very favourably this morning. He said first, “ Surely you are making a very great stir about this ; but it is Sir Culling who is doing it all.” (Laughter.) You know whether or not that is true, Sir. I have been in the habit of seeing your name in the public prints for years ; but I never had the pleasure of looking at you before, and I must say you do not look more formidable in that Chair than you do upon paper. (Laughter.) However, I could not help telling him, that if a man ten times greater than Sir Culling had tried to call up these spirits from the Country, and that had been all, he would not have succeeded. (Hear, hear.) It was, I said, the feeling of their own minds, which told them that the voice of Sir Culling was, in this instance, a voice that they ought to obey. “ Well,” he said, “ it is the Dissenters principally who are interesting themselves about this matter ; the Churchmen are not interesting themselves much about it.” “ If that be so,” I said, “ how do you account for this, that the Vicar of Huddersfield drew up the Petition with his own hand ; signed the Petition himself ; and took care that every Clergyman within the range of his influence should do the same ?” He appeared to comprehend that (laughter) ; and I will tell you why. The Petition was not sent to him to present. The Vicar, apprehending at first, that he would be favourable to the measure, took care to send it to a Member, to whom that objection did not apply. “ Well,” said he, “ supposing you are all interested in this great question, and see eye to eye upon it, it only shows how much Parliament is in advance of the Country.” (Laughter.) You must know, Sir Culling, that our Member is a Liberal ; and we are almost all Liberals in Huddersfield. He said, “ I told you, when we were in power, that we were in advance of the Country ; and now it is proved, that even the Conservatives are in advance of the Country : they are all before you.” I said, “ I cannot dispute your judgment, Mr. Stansfield, upon a question of this sort ; I believe they are in advance of us, but they are in advance in latitudinarianism.” “ Well,” he said, “ if you are determined to go on with this thing, you will be in a pretty mess shortly : Sir Robert Peel will resign.” The idea of a Whig talking of Sir Robert Peel’s resigning, as a great calamity ! (Laughter.) Mr. Stansfield said, “ If you do not let this measure pass, depend upon it there will be no strong Government to carry on the affairs of the Country. I said, “ I apprehend, Sir, that we have very little to do with consequences. (Hear, hear.) It is for you politicians to talk about consequences, and the results of certain measures. You make sad work in legislation, by looking so much to consequences ; it would be much better for you to do right, and leave the consequences to themselves.” (Hear, hear.) He then adverted to the sufferings of the Irish people, and said it was necessary to do something for them, and they ought not to be persecuted any longer. I replied, “ We do not want to persecute them ; we are prepared to offer to them everything that we enjoy ourselves.” He said, “ You do not allow them Religious Liberty.” I asked him to tell me any one thing, in which the Irish Roman Catholics did not enjoy the same Liberty as I do. But he only said, “ Well, you are a great deal richer than they are ; and you Dissenters can afford to support your own Religion ; but these Irish Catholics are very poor indeed, and they cannot support their own Religion.” I said, “ I want them to have the same power and privilege that I have

myself; and that is, to profess, practise, and propagate it with my own means; and that, I think, is all that they ought to expect at our hands." "Well," he said, "I should not object so much to that, provided they had their own funds back again. I voted for Mr. Ward's motion, intending to restore the resources of the Irish Church to the Roman Catholics." "Well," I replied, "that is a question between the two Churches, and we do not mean to interfere in it; we leave them to settle that question between themselves: but we are determined, that you shall not make us support a false Religion, and Doctrines of which we conscientiously disapprove." After a little more conversation in the same strain, I said, "You know, Mr. Stansfield, we have not come here to complain; we have merely come to state, what is the feeling of your constituents." He said, "I am very sorry for it: I am very sincere in my convictions on this point; I do not see how Ireland is to be governed, and kept together, unless you consent to this." "Well," I said, "that is not our affair." Just as we were coming away, I said to the Hon. Member, "What is your notion of the harmony that ought to exist between the Representative and the Represented? When the constituency is all one way, what is the duty of their Representative in Parliament?" "Why," said he, "I believe that question has never been settled." I said, "I think that, on a great question like this, there ought at least to be something like harmony." "Why," he said, "on local matters there ought to be sympathy." "Oh!" I said, "then, if we want to establish water-works, or to do anything of that kind, we are to sympathise: but if the question is one of Civil and Religious Liberty, that is a point upon which we may differ!—agreement in that case is not essential!" (Laughter.) He said, "I have been thinking, it might perhaps be my duty to resign the Representation." "Now, observe, Mr. Stansfield," said I, "we never said a word to you about resigning; and as to the consequence, that is between ourselves," (laughter:) I ought to do the Hon. Gentleman the justice to state, that he said, "I have voted for the First and Second Reading, and of course I am bound to vote for the Third Reading." I then mentioned to him, the ground for changing his course, which has been assigned by some gentlemen this morning, with reference to another Member. I said, "Perhaps you voted for the First and Second Reading, in the hope that Parliament would have been induced to endow the College out of the funds of the Irish Church; and, as the motion for doing that has not been carried, you have a very good reason for withholding your vote. But you are placed in this dilemma; you must either vote for the measure, in order to be consistent, or you must absent yourself from the Third Reading of the Bill; because if you vote for the Third Reading, after learning that nearly every one of your constituents is against the Bill, you will be misrepresenting them." (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—I would very shortly suggest to gentlemen going to Members of Parliament, holding opinions of that kind, that it might be very expedient to refer to the Debates on Lord Althorp's Church-rate Bill. I am not going to allude to the right or wrong of Church-rates; but I think it will be found, that all Members of Parliament, who were on the liberal side, laid down this principle,—that A should not be taxed for B's religion. Now every liberal, who, after having said that, does now vote for taxing us to maintain Popery, is

acting inconsistently. (Hear, hear.) I would strongly advise a general reference to that very useful book "Hansard" on that subject. (Laughter.) Gentlemen, we will now suspend the hearing of reports from different places, in order that two important subjects may be brought before us ; one by our friend, Mr. Baines, of Leeds, and the other by the Rev. Dr. Halley, of Manchester.

E. BAINES, jun., Esq., of Leeds.—In the Conferences that have been held with Members of Parliament, I am sure the Deputies will have found two great obstacles to their success. The first is, that we are late in our movement ; many Members having committed themselves by their votes. The second is, that many of the Members, and especially those on the Liberal side of the House,—as, for instance, the Member of whom Mr. Willans has spoken,—and the interview with whom he has so well described,—turn round on us at the close of our argument, and ask, "But what is to be done for Ireland?" (Hear, hear.) That is the great point, which they continually press upon you :—"What is to be done for Ireland?" You remember that, in his peculiarly solemn peroration on the Second Reading of the Bill, Sir Robert Peel put the same point very strongly to the House of Commons. "What," said he, "is to be done for Ireland? and how are you to govern Ireland?" I think none of us can help viewing the question as one of great importance ; and it is one which we shall be anxious to answer as well as we are able. I am quite sure, that there will be unanimity in this Meeting on this point ; that we do not wish to do anything unjust to Ireland, (hear, hear ;) that the course we are taking, is one which is dictated by conscience, and not by any species of ill-will towards the people of that Country. (Hear, hear.) That being so, it seems to me, that we are bound to state the fact. And, in reference to the observation which I made at the commencement, as to the Members of the House of Commons having so unfortunately committed themselves by their votes, before they were aware of the opinions of the people, and before the people had had time to express their opinions,—I would observe, that it has seemed to the Committee exceedingly desirable, that the Deputies here assembled should take time by the forelock, with regard to another branch of the Legislature ; that the House of Lords may not be in the same position as some of the Members of the House of Commons ; that they, at least, may understand, what are your opinions, and the opinions of the people generally, before they are called upon to vote at all upon this measure. It has, therefore, seemed desirable to the Committee, that a Petition to the House of Lords should be drawn up, and submitted to this Assembly for its approval ; that it should be signed by the Chairman, and sent to that Right Honourable House, that it may be carefully weighed by them ; and that they may know, what are the opinions of the people, and what is the value of the other Petitions which may come up to them. And it seemed to us right, that, in doing so, the question should be laid very fairly and fully and plainly before them ; and a Petition, with that view, has been drawn up, which will distinctly express both your feelings and your opinions as regards the Irish people, and distinctly inform both branches of the Legislature, what is the exact position which you occupy with regard to the Government of Ireland. And, having drawn up such a Petition, it seemed right to the Committee, that the same Petition,—containing the same disclaimer, and the same

explanations,—should be presented also to the House of Commons. The Petition, therefore, which I have now to submit to you, is one which is intended to answer these various purposes ; and I will proceed without further explanation, to read it to the Conference :—

To the Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in Parliament assembled.

The humble Petition of a numerous body of Deputies from many parts of Great Britain and Ireland, met in London to oppose the Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth,

Humbly sheweth,

That your petitioners solemnly and anxiously disclaim all personal, political, or national ill-will to their fellow-subjects the Roman Catholics of Ireland ; that it is their earnest desire to cultivate feelings of affection towards that numerous portion of their fellow-countrymen, and to be united with them by the bonds of patriotism and of loyalty ; that they sympathise with the people of Ireland in the physical depression of its peasantry, and would rejoice in any just and wise measure for the amelioration of their condition ; and that they approve of equitable, kindly, and indulgent treatment of the Irish people, both by the Executive Government and the Legislature.

But, whilst cherishing these sentiments, your petitioners regard with disapprobation and alarm the proposition of Her Majesty's Ministers to give a large and permanent Endowment to the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth,—an Institution established for the training of Roman Catholic priests, and in which doctrines are taught strongly at variance with the distinguishing doctrines of the Protestant Religion.

That your petitioners and the Protestant population of the cities and towns in which they dwell, without distinction of sect or party, feel conscientious objections to the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Religion by the State,—a policy of which the Endowment of Maynooth College can only be a commencement, and which gives Parliamentary and national sanction to the lamentable errors of that Religion ; that your petitioners and their Protestant fellow-countrymen object to that measure and policy, not from any feelings of asperity or bigotry, but from a solemn and religious conviction that they cannot, without offending against Divine truth, consent to be thus made partakers in the teaching and spreading of Roman Catholic doctrine.

That your petitioners differ amongst each other as to minor points of Christian doctrine, and also on the important question of the right or duty of the State to employ national funds in the maintenance of Religion ; but, nevertheless, they concur in disapproving of the Endowment of the Roman Catholic religion in any form ; and as their objections are founded on religious principles, they are not likely to be removed or mitigated.

That the Endowment of Maynooth, which is professedly intended to unite more closely the people of Great Britain and of Ireland, and to allay agitation in the latter Country, is, in the opinion of your petitioners, calculated to produce the very opposite effects,—inasmuch as it compels the Protestants of the United Kingdom to give their utmost resistance to the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Religion, and to set forth the grounds of that resistance ; and further, as it will naturally lead the Roman Catholics to expect the full Endowment of their Clergy by the State, and to feel discontent so long as that measure is withheld.

That the Endowment of the Roman Catholic Religion by the State would, in point of principle and of precedent, justify the Endowment of every other form of Religion

professed in any part of the Empire, however far removed from the truth, or from Christianity itself—a policy to which your petitioners, whatever may be their opinions on Ecclesiastical Establishments, have the strongest objections, as tending to destroy, in popular estimation, the difference between truth and error, and to degrade Religion into a mere engine of Political Government.

That with these views, and leaving to the wisdom of Parliament such measures of Civil Government as may conduce to the benefit and prosperity of Ireland, your petitioners on their own behalf, and on behalf of their Protestant fellow-countrymen by whom they have been deputed, earnestly and solemnly pray your Right Honourable House not to sanction any Bill for the Endowment of the College of Maynooth.

The Rev. C. PREST said—I am sorry to intrude myself on the attention of this Meeting; and, after all that has been said on the general question in other places, and at other times—and after previous public exposition of my own opinions, I need, I am sure, scarcely say a single word. I am, however, anxious to have the honour of seconding the Resolution which has just been proposed. We, as Wesleyans, have participated (in common with all who have been associated against this unprincipled measure,) in a great deal of alarm and a great deal of misrepresentation, in regard to the unkindness which, it is said, we feel towards our fellow-subjects in Ireland. For myself I reply, that the charge is utterly false; I reply, on behalf of the Wesleyans, that the charge is utterly false; and I reply, on behalf of the Protestants of this great empire, that the charge is entirely without foundation. We are willing, and we are desirous, that Ireland should have every advantage which she can have, in equal laws, equal civil privileges, equal religious liberties; but we do object, and we must object, to that false liberalism, into which some men would seek to draw us. But they will not do it, either by smiles on the one hand, or by frowns on the other. Too many men are looking, with guilty indifference, upon all Religions as equally important. I, for one, am not at all prepared ever to see Religion brought down from its high and glorious loftiness, to become the mere engine of State Policy. If I understand anything at all of the duties of Christian legislation, such legislation is only valuable as *Christian legislation*; and can only sustain that character, so far as it subordinates all its principles and all its details to Religion. Now, I say I am anxious to second this Resolution, because it did so happen, that, in another place, last Friday,—in a very large Meeting, representing the Wesleyans of London,—this very subject came under consideration; and a Resolution which embodies, I am sure, the entire honest judgment of all the Wesleyans in this Empire, was adopted. I will take the liberty of reading that Resolution, as being a full and fair expression of the opinions of that great body with which I have the honour to be associated. The Resolution is this:—

“That this Meeting, as a portion of the Wesleyan-Methodist Connexion, which has, for nearly a century, annually expended a large sum of money in endeavouring to improve the religious and social state of all classes of the population of Ireland, entirely and indignantly denies the allegation, that, in opposing the present Bill for the establishment of a Seminary in which the worst forms of Popish error are taught, it is actuated by feelings of hostility or ill-will to the inhabitants of that part of the

Empire. It is satisfied, and willing, to contribute to every measure of sound and Christian policy for developing the resources, improving the commerce, advancing the prosperity, and securing the loyalty and tranquillity, of Ireland; and yields to none in honest desires to give and preserve to her equal rights and equal laws: but it most earnestly protests against any attempt to conciliate the Roman Catholics of Ireland by such an outrage upon the religious principles and feelings of British Protestants, as is now offered by a Measure, which, it believes, will never secure any of these desirable objects; but which will rather tend to perpetuate and aggravate the miseries of that Country, and will increase the perplexities, and endanger the tranquillity and integrity, of the United Kingdom:—and more especially, as there is every reason to believe, that the present is but one of a series of Measures of still more injurious and Anti-Protestant tendency.”

I submit that Resolution to the Meeting, as the exposition of our sentiments, and because it is in perfect harmony with that which I have the honour of seconding,—and which (I am perfectly sure) will be adopted by this Meeting, and by the Protestants of the Empire,—as a sound, a Scriptural, and a consistently Protestant exposition of their good-will towards that highly interesting portion of the Empire,—for the prosperity of which we have prayed, and we have laboured,—and are willing to pray, and labour, and to make any sacrifices which we may be called upon to make, but one,—and that sacrifice we will never make—the sacrifice of Religious Principle! (Cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. MASSIE.—I do not rise to say a single word against the Petition. I rise to say, that I exercise forbearance towards it; so far as it seems to recognise an appeal to the House of Lords on the matter of Religion, I exercise forbearance in the matter. I do not object; but I wish to be understood as keeping myself clear from that appeal.

The CHAIRMAN.—I cannot but admire our friend's frankness on the subject. I am known to participate in the views which he takes on religious questions; but allow me to say, that—whether it be right or wrong that the Legislature should interfere—they are now interfering; and therefore, whatever we may say on other questions, we may fitly say, “Do not interfere on this.” Ours is a negative prayer entirely. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. S. NICHOLSON.—Without the slightest expectation on my part, and certainly without my desiring it, you did me the honour yesterday of naming me as a member of the Conference Committee. I conclude, therefore, that, as a member of the Conference Committee, I shall be understood to share the responsibility of preparing those documents which are submitted in the sittings of the Conference. Now I entirely sympathise in the remarks of my friend who spoke last, as to referring Religious matters to the decision of the Legislature. But, Sir, further than that, it was my earnest desire that all those members of this Conference who entertain Voluntary Principles, should be able to report, when the Conference had terminated, that, whilst there had been no unlovely assertion of the Voluntary Principle on the one hand, there had been nothing done by the Conference—no language used, and no step taken—which could be considered as in the slightest degree compromising that Principle. I have heard the document read, for the first time, and I think it is a grave document. I think it does touch the question. I cannot tell whether it touches it as a tangent simply, or whether it goes into



it; but I submit to the Conference, the great importance of having that document referred to a Select Committee of persons, who are acquainted with the Voluntary Principle on the one side, and with the Establishment Principle on the other, for the purpose of proving to the entire community, the anxious desire of this Conference to avoid any infraction, however remote or indirect, of the Principles of Voluntaryism. I do not wish, therefore, to enter into a discussion on the subject; but I propose that the document read should undergo revision, for the object, and with the motive, which I have just stated.

The Rev. J. ROBERTSON, of Edinburgh.—I have listened to the Petition with very great satisfaction on the whole; but I feel it to be a matter of such great importance, that I entirely concur in the observations which have just been made. I am not certain that I have any objection to offer; but I think it is due to the opinions and convictions of various Members of this Conference, to furnish them with a fair opportunity of deliberately considering the document which has just been read; and therefore I cordially and earnestly second the proposal. I hope that the Committee will feel it to be their duty, to delay the further consideration of it till the next Meeting.

E. BAINES, jun., Esq., of Leeds.—I quite agree with both the gentlemen who have just spoken, that this document is of great importance; but I beg to say, that the very course which they recommend has already been taken. This Petition was read by myself to the Conference Committee this morning; and by them it was referred to a Sub-Committee, in order that it might be laid before this Meeting. That Sub-Committee consisted of the Rev. Dr. Halley, of Manchester, a Voluntary; of myself, a Voluntary; and of the Rev. R. Thomas, a Clergyman of the Church of England. I think, therefore, that the Voluntaries need not be alarmed. But—as it is extremely important that those gentlemen should be fully satisfied—I will read the paragraph which distinctly reserves our opinion upon that point. One of the paragraphs is this.—

The Rev. S. NICHOLSON.—I would suggest the propriety of the Petition being read over again, clause by clause. How is it to be expected, that a Meeting such as this should be prepared at once to give a decided opinion upon a document, which occupied the Committee for a great length of time, and which they went through clause by clause?

J. McLAREN, Esq., of Edinburgh.—I would suggest, that the Petition should be read over again very slowly. Though I think the recommendation of Mr. Nicholson is a very good one, it is quite impossible to discuss the several clauses of the Petition in so large an assembly.

The Rev. C. PREST.—I quite approve of the suggestion, that the Petition should be read over again distinctly; I believe that, if that is done, there will not appear to be any reason for referring it to a Committee.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think it is highly probable, that after hearing the Petition again read, no objection to it will be made.

Mr. E. BAINES then read over again the whole of the Petition. After he had read to the close, he said—

I will simply say, Sir Culling, that it seems to me highly desirable that such opinions, and such disclaimers as we express with regard to the people of Ireland, and such assertions of our good-will towards them, should not be

altogether lost. I fear, that, if this Petition were referred to a Committee, there may not be so large an assemblage of Deputies present when it is brought up again, (otherwise I should not have the slightest objection to the adoption of that course,) and that therefore the Petition might be lost. I think, moreover, with respect to the point mentioned by Dr. Massie, that we need be under no anxiety, on the ground that we are petitioning the House of Lords on the subject of Religion. What *we* petition for is just this—that they will let Religion alone. (Hear, hear.) If we petition the House of Commons—and my friend Dr. Massie has himself taken part in forwarding Petitions to that branch of the Legislature—(hear, hear,)—we may, with equal consistency, petition the House of Lords in the same manner—that is, just to let Religion alone altogether.

The CHAIRMAN.—If any of our friends have a serious doubt about the matter, I think the Petition should not be pressed in opposition to their feelings; but my own conviction is, that there is not the slightest ground for hesitation.

The Rev. Dr. MASSIE.—Would it not prevent all difficulty, if a small Sub-Committee were to retire immediately? (Cries of “No, no.”) I hope I shall be allowed to express my opinion. I uttered the opinion, which I did with the greatest deference; and I believe, that the time we are spending in talking about it would be sufficient for a Sub-Committee to report their opinion upon it. I have merely risen, to prevent it from going abroad, that I countenance the House of Lords, or any other house, providing a Religion for me.

The Rev. Dr. HALLEY.—I think, Sir, that we are all safe from my friend’s objection. I fully concur in the opinion which he has expressed, about petitioning either House of Parliament to do anything with regard to Religion; but the prayer of this Petition is, simply that they will not do a certain thing,—that they will not pass the Grant to Maynooth. All the rest is merely the statement of our opinions; and I think I may very fairly tell the House of Lords, or anybody else, what I think upon any subject whatsoever,—provided I do not put into the prayer of the Petition any request that the Legislative Power should be employed for the purposes of Religion. All the honour and credit of this Petition belong to Mr. Baines, who drew it up; and I looked carefully to this point of objection, on the religious ground, that whatever objections there were on religious grounds, they were not expressed in the prayer of the Petition. The other parts of the Petition are simply statements of what we think, and not what we ask the Lords to do.

Hereupon some further discussion took place with regard to the wording of the Petition, and the propriety of referring it again to a Sub-Committee: in which Mr. M’Laren, Mr. Baines, jun., the Rev. C. Prest, the Rev. James Roberts, the Rev. S. Nicholson, the Rev. A. M. Brown, the Rev. James Kelly, an Irish Clergyman, the Rev. J. Patterson, of Manchester, the Rev. J. N. Goulty, of Brighton, Mr. J. M’Ilvaine, of Greenock, the Rev. E. Prout, of Halstead, the Rev. Dr. Halley, the Rev. Dr. Reed, W. H. Ashton, Esq., of Stockport, and the Rev. J. T. Robinson, and some others, took part. It served to evince the great care which was taken, to avoid any expression which could compromise the conscientious convictions of any one present; and ended

in the cordial concurrence of all in the Petition which had been previously drawn up.

Whereupon, A DEPUTY observed.—I would suggest, that the number of Deputies, composing the Conference, should be stated in that Petition.

Mr. E. BAINES, jun.—We have not now the number : but when Sir Culling gives the Petition to one of their Lordships for presentation, he will state the number. The motion which I have to propose is,—“That the following Petition be sent on the part of the Deputies, with the signature of the Chairman to the House of Lords, and (*mutatis mutandis*) to the House of Commons.”

The CHAIRMAN.—I should be happy to be able to say that every hand was held up in favour of this motion.

The motion was then put from the Chair, and was carried unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, I beg to congratulate you, and thus publicly to express our thanks to Almighty God, that so difficult a subject—the dealing with a piece of difficult criticism like the present—has been brought to an harmonious conclusion.

Gentlemen, I must now ask your patient attention for a little while, to another subject of importance.

The Rev. Dr. HALLEY, of Manchester.—Whatever might be the feeling of the Conference in reference to the last subject of discussion, I feel that I am now about to do what will be very unpopular in this assembly.—I hope, however, that you will very calmly consider the subject ; and I can only express a wish, that what I have to propose had been intrusted to some person more likely to conciliate regard for it, and better known than myself in this Conference. But there are several of us who have been placed in a very painful position, by a Resolution which was passed last night. I am aware that it may be thought, that we ought to have been present on the occasion, to have made our objections *then* if we felt any. We were engaged, however, upon the business of this Body ; and I think that, but for the altered circumstances, there would have been no remedy left, and we must have remained silent. Circumstances have, however, very much changed since last evening ; and I have found, that the feelings of my own mind, and of the minds of some of my friends, have been participated in by several other Members of this Conference ; and that they now think, that some change in our course ought to take place. I refer to the fourth Resolution which was passed last night. I fear that, in saying this, I may damp the warm feelings of many in this assembly. We did feel, however, that that Resolution pledged us to a course, for which several of us were not prepared. We felt, that we were scarcely clothed with sufficient power from our constituents. Sir Robert Peel, however, having now stated, that he will postpone the Third Reading of the Bill until the 19th of May, the matter is placed in a very different position from that in which it stood before. Those of us who before felt, that we could not pledge ourselves to sign an Address to the Queen, to dissolve Parliament,—because the Dissolution of Parliament was a much more serious matter than we, without further consultation with our constituents, were prepared to enter upon,—find now that many who before differed from us are of opinion, that (on account of the three intervening weeks) we should not pledge ourselves, in the Public Meeting to-night, to appeal to the Queen to dissolve Parliament, in

case of the Third Reading of this Bill ; thinking that, when we return to our constituents, we shall find many who would not be prepared to take this step. Therefore I beg leave to move a Resolution upon this subject. I cast it upon your consideration. I entreat you to think—though I know there is some difficulty about the matter—I entreat you to think of the position in which you meet this morning, compared with that which you occupied last evening. This Resolution has been brought before the Conference Committee ; by them it has been submitted to a Sub-Committee ; and now it is brought here upon my responsibility alone,—although I feel deeply that responsibility. The Resolution which I have to propose is this :—

“That,—it having been ascertained, since the passing of the fourth Resolution of last evening, that the Third Reading of the Maynooth Endowment Bill will not take place until the 19th of May ; in consequence of which, opportunity will be afforded to prepare Petitions to the House of Lords, and also to allow the Deputies to consult with the persons whom they represent,—they be recommended, on their return, to convene their respective constituencies, and to consider the propriety and the most effective means of presenting an Address to Her Majesty, praying for a Dissolution of Parliament ; and that the measures contemplated by this Conference, in reference to such an Address, be postponed, until a vote of the House of Lords be taken upon the Bill, should it unhappily pass its future stages in the House of Commons.”

Our reasons for proposing this, Sir, are much strengthened by interviews with several Members last evening—who thought that the threat of a Dissolution, before they had decided the question, was a very likely thing to rouse feelings of opposition. It was thought, too, that it would not be respectful to the Lords, to assume, at the present moment, that they will pass this Bill ; (hear, hear,) that we should, at least, give them the opportunity of expressing some opinion on the subject. It was thought by many, that we ought to confer with our opponents, who have not gone with us on the subject, before we acted upon such a Resolution as that of last evening. I know that some will be compelled to retire from the Conference, unless some change in this respect shall take place ; because they feel, that they are not authorised at present to pledge themselves to such a course. For these reasons, and some others, which I will not detain you by mentioning, I beg to submit this Resolution to the Meeting.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—I was thought last evening to be somewhat committed to the proposition. By the phrases introduced, however, I was careful to make the matter contingent, that we might have an opportunity of reviewing the Resolution.

The Rev. SAMUEL THODEY, of Cambridge.—I beg to second the Resolution ; and I will take the opportunity of saying, that, coming as I do from Cambridge, I can bear testimony to the strength and earnestness of the feelings of different religious bodies there, in favour of your proceedings.

THOMAS PRICE, Esq., of York.—I was in hopes that I should have had the opportunity last night of saying a few words in reference to York. I am the only Deputy from that City, representing the Church party, the Wesleyans, the Independents, and others. Petitions have there been got up, to the House of Commons and to the House of Lords. The Meetings which

have been held, have been most unanimous in opposition to this measure. There is but one feeling in fact; and that, a feeling of intense dislike to this abominable Maynooth Bill.

J. MATHER, Esq., of South Shields.—I decidedly object to changing a Resolution, which was adopted in a much larger Meeting last night; thinking, that no sufficient ground has been assigned for pursuing such a course. I think the Resolution of last night was well deliberated upon. All the present circumstances were taken into consideration, with the exception of a few days' postponement of the measure. Has there been any announcement from the Minister of the Crown, or any other party, that the measure is to be *discontinued*? (A voice, "Yes.") It is *postponed* merely, for three short weeks; and, I fear, for the political purpose of giving an opportunity for the evaporation of the feeling which has been excited in the Country. I venture to submit, that we can scarcely venture to rescind a Resolution which was passed last night, without some new and better ground being assigned.

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—I beg to express my concurrence in the sentiments just expressed. I do not think we can put any such construction on the unexpected postponement of the measure, as would justify us in the eyes of the public, if—after our deliberation has gone forth—we should be so inconsistent with ourselves as to reverse our decision. We must look at the aspect which our proceedings will bear, if there be any retraction without an apparent reason. I cannot help remarking, that it is rather to be regretted that, in the public Resolutions which have appeared in the papers, no Clergyman of the Established Church should have appeared as the proposer or seconder. This will, I fear, tend to confirm Sir Robert Peel's notion, that the movement is entirely confined to the Dissenters. (Hear, hear.)

Rev. T. N. GOULTY.—The Resolution passed last night should be read, I think, before we rescind it. If I recollect right, it proceeds on the assumption of the possibility of this measure being passed. Of course it will drop to the ground, if it does not pass; so that I see no necessity whatever for rescinding that Resolution. It refers to what is to be done, *in the event of* this Bill being passed in the House of Commons.

The Resolution passed the previous evening was then read by the Chairman.

The Rev. Dr. HALLEY.—Let me remark—first, that many gentlemen did think, that it would be unconstitutional to send an Address to the Queen, to do a certain thing on a contingency; in the next place, the Resolution appeared to be contradictory, because it recommends the constituents to send Addresses to the Queen, *if* the Third Reading of the Bill should be carried; but leaves it to Her to take a different course if it be not. By the Resolution of last night, the Queen is requested to do something, *if* the House of Commons should do something else; which we have no right to conclude that they ever will do; and, in the minds of many Members, there are very great objections to the adoption of such a course. In the next place, we, in Manchester, do not mean to make a farce of the next Election; and we think, that, if any good is to come of such a step, we ought to consult the leading men of our own opinions, and the leading men of different parties, who have influence in such matters. Our influence in Manchester, and in many other Towns, will, I am sure, all depend upon such consultation beforehand. Then

we think further, that it is not respectful to the House of Lords, to assume, as it has been assumed, that it is of no use to consult *them*. We do not think, that you should go to the very last resort which the Constitution affords, before you have taken the second ; and that no man can take this step, unless he is of opinion, that the House of Lords ought to be put out of sight, as a branch of the Legislature. We think, therefore, that the constitutional course is—first, to go to the House of Commons ; next, to take a vote in the House of Lords ; and then, in the third place, to consider how we may approach the Throne. To present an Address to Her Majesty, before the Lords have had this Bill before them, does appear to us a course which is open to great objection. These are, we conceive, strong and important objections, unless you mean to treat this matter as a mere trifle. Three weeks will elapse, before the Third Reading can take place in the House of Commons ; and a week's discussion of it is anticipated in the House of Lords. It will probably be nearly six weeks before it will pass that House ; and this is a material circumstance in considering the present question. If, as I said before, the circumstances were not altered since last night ; if Sir Robert Peel had not stated, that the Bill would be deferred till the 19th of May, we should have said nothing ; though we should have still felt, that we could not pledge ourselves to seek a Dissolution of Parliament in our present circumstances. But here are circumstances altogether varying the matter. Let me here observe, that the Secretaries declare, that the publication of that Resolution was a mistake altogether ; that it was not done through their intention, or with their knowledge : there has been a mistake in the business so far. On all these grounds, I do again press the Resolution.

The Rev. WILLIAM BUNTING.—It was understood that the Resolutions were to be advertised ; and, as there were reporters present, it was quite imaginary that we could prevent them from being published. The question had received the fullest consideration ; and, looking at the whole nature of the question, the Resolution received the unanimous assent of the Meeting. It has been announced by Sir Robert Peel in Parliament, that he will spare no efforts to pass the Bill through Parliament ; and the delay may be one of his means of effecting that object. When the Members of the Conference are scattered to their homes, and there is no longer an opportunity for them to impress their views on Parliament and the public, Sir Robert Peel may come down to the House, and press the motion for the Third Reading of the Bill. What is the difficulty with respect to the House of Peers ? When the Bill has passed the House of Peers, it will be too late. The Bill will be an act of Parliament before forty-eight hours are passed ; it will be registered in the Constitution of this Country : and then it will be too late. I have been a most gratified listener to all our proceedings ; but on this step I must protest against retrogression. There is another reason why I object to the proposal which has been made. I do not think the House of Commons deserves any respect. (Cries of "Order, order.") I will not press that observation ; but I am sure I had no desire to give offence.

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—Had the Resolution not been seconded already, I should have felt particular pleasure in seconding it. It agrees with the opinion which I have before repeatedly expressed in Committee on this sub-

ject, and to which I ventured to give some indistinct expression last night, that, in a Public Meeting, consisting of a large body of persons holding different views, no man must be too tenacious about his particular notions. We must look rather to the general principle, and to the effect produced by the general proceedings of the Conference as a whole. But I own that I do not like to hear, in this assembly, any general reflections on the Legislature of the Country. Say what you will about the conduct of the House of Commons on this Maynooth Grant; there ought to be no expressions permitted here, which diverge into more general and comprehensive reflections. We must allow each other a little difference of opinion; and on that ground I waive my objections to this Resolution. But I have stated again and again in Committee, my objection to acting, as though we set aside the House of Lords—the constitutional remedy for an unwise, and (I have no objection at all to say) an iniquitous decision of the House of Commons. The Constitution presumes, that, owing to various circumstances, the decisions of a popular Assembly, like the House of Commons, often need revision; and it appoints the House of Lords to revise them. We ought to try all constitutional methods first. At the same time, when we were told, that there would be so little time—and rightly told, so far as the public knew—it did appear right that we should waive that principle, and let the public know, and the House of Commons know, and the House of Lords know—and indirectly let the Queen know—that such an ultimate measure was in contemplation—and, in the contingency supposed, would by many be adopted,—as that of requiring a change in the House of Commons. But why lose the little chance which you still have, of seeing this measure rejected in the House of Lords? The Members of that House will say, “You are, by the Resolution which you have passed, setting us aside altogether; you are taking it for granted, that we have no power in the Constitution—that we are not the Second Estate in the Realm.” It is quite right, to say what you will do, *if* the prior remedy fails; but will you go to this extreme measure, while you are neglecting a constitutional remedy? Look yet at the little chance which you have; I wish I could believe that it is stronger and greater than it is—but still, from what occurred last night, I think there is some hope,—more or less; and we ought not to throw our chance away. In this place we are strong; we are naturally confident; the assembly of four or five hundred gentlemen, on an occasion like this, cannot but make us a little enthusiastic; but let us look soberly at the thing, and go quietly and calmly to work. I believe that the measure proposed in the Resolution of last night, will have a better chance of ultimate success with the Queen herself, and with those who must be her advisers, if we do not pass a practical affront on the House of Lords. I heartily agree in Dr. Halley’s motion, and concur in the great importance which he attaches to it.

The Rev. J. T. ROBINSON, Rector of St. Andrew’s, Holborn.—I cannot allow an observation, made by a gentleman on my right, to pass in this Meeting without protesting against it. I understood that gentleman to say, that, if this Bill passed the House of Commons, it would become the law of the land in eight-and-forty hours.

Rev. W. BUNTING.—*The Lords.*

The Rev. J. T. ROBINSON.—Then I say nothing on that subject. But allow me to say, whilst I am speaking, with reference to the observation that Clergymen have not either proposed or seconded Resolutions in this Conference, that I myself was asked to perform that office, and declined to accept it.

The Rev. JAMES KELLY.—As I understood, the object of the Resolution passed was, that, in the event of the Bill passing the House of Commons, we should memorialise the Queen. Now, whether the time which elapses be long or short, the Conference has committed itself to memorialising the Queen; and I would submit it to the Meeting, whether, in case the measure be stopped in the House of Lords, the House of Commons will give satisfaction to the Country?

The CHAIRMAN.—I would venture to say, in reply to that question, it would then not be a question for this Conference. The House of Commons may, or may not, give satisfaction to the Country; but then the Country may express its opinion. May God grant, that that contingency may happen! that it may be rejected by the House of Commons!

The Rev. S. NICHOLSON.—It would not be respectful to Her Majesty, I think, to send a Memorial to Her in contingent terms; and, if we wait till the Bill pass, this Meeting will have lost its corporate character. I do not conceive, that we are in a condition to prepare a Memorial, to be used in case the necessity for it should arise.

The Rev. Dr. HALLEY.—It was proposed by the Committee, that,—if this Bill passes the House of Commons, and gets into the House of Lords, and when no other hope remains,—we should (with the consent of our constituents) assemble again on this question. (Hear.) We are not going to abandon the question at the last moment. (Cheers.) Do not let it be anticipated for a moment, that we shall abandon the question, whilst there is the slightest ray of hope.

The Rev. S. NICHOLSON.—Then allow me to say, that, if we are to assemble again, there can be no occasion to do *now*, what we shall do *then*. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN, at the request of several Deputies, then read the Resolution.

The Rev. S. NICHOLSON.—I intended my observations to go to no furtherance of that view of the case.

The Rev. H. ROBBINS.—I think there is a great difference of opinion, as to what is the real question; and I do hope, that we shall not come to any decision, before the matter is understood. My own feeling is, that the Meeting did last night, rightly or wrongly, pledge itself to go to the Queen, *if* Parliament take a certain course. The question is, Whether we are abandoning that ground, or altering our system of tactics? I deprecate our hurrying on to a precipitate conclusion. Last night we decided, that it was right, in a certain case, to ask the Queen to dissolve Parliament; and I, at least, have no inclination to rescind the vote to which we then came.

The Rev. Dr. MASSIE.—I beg to state, that, if I understand the Resolution which is now proposed, it is not a rescinding of the intention of memorialising Her Majesty; it merely signifies, that we are now in circumstances to take the opinion of our constituents on the Resolution which was passed



last night ; there being individuals amongst us, who are unable conscientiously to adopt the step of memorialising the Queen *now*, because we have not yet consulted our constituents. We feel, that it is a duty, which *may* devolve upon us, to memorialise Her Majesty ; but we feel also, that our best mode of preparing to memorialise Her Majesty will be, to return to our constituents,—to convene Meetings in order to consult them ; and, as soon as they have authorised us to do it, we shall not merely do it by the Resolution of this Conference, but with the ardent sympathy of the people themselves.

The Rev. H. ROBBINS.—I do not think we shall be doing any violence to our Manchester friends, by not adopting this last Resolution. If they cannot act up to what seems to be the opinion of the majority of this Conference, we can only regret it. So that I think we appear to be rather misunderstanding each other. The majority, I take it, do not bind the minority individually. It is not with regard to the general policy of petitioning the Queen, I believe, that there is a want of unanimity ?

The CHAIRMAN.—Allow me to say, that this Resolution does not do away with that ; it only says, that the measure contemplated shall be postponed, till a vote of the House of Lords has been taken.

The Rev. H. ROBBINS.—Then perhaps I was wrong in using the words I have done ; it seems that, by the Resolution of last night, we are not at once to set about doing anything.

The Rev. Dr. HALLEY.—Yes, in the Public Meeting to-night. (Hear, hear.) What answer do you expect the Queen to give ? You set about memorialising Her Majesty, to do a thing, upon which (though you have no answer) you still suppose there must be an opinion formed ; you suppose that she can consider the question, before the Commons decide upon the Third Reading, whether she will dissolve the Parliament or not ? You ask her to consider her course before the event. Is it to be supposed, that—Addresses having been presented to the Queen previously to the passing of the Bill—she will proceed to the consideration of the question ? She ought not to read an Address of that sort. It is no case for her to consider, till she is in the circumstances under which you memorialise her. It is on this that we found our objection to the Memorial being proposed to-night.

The Rev. H. ROBBINS.—The Resolution is,

“That, in the event that the Bill should pass the House of Commons, it will, in the judgment of this Meeting, become the solemn duty of the people of this Country, to address themselves to Her Majesty to dissolve that Parliament, the Commons of which have confessedly failed to conform their Legislative acts to the almost unanimous opinion of their Constituents ; and that the Committee do prepare an Address from this Conference to the Queen ; and also a Resolution, recommending similar Addresses from all the Constituencies of the Empire ; and that both be submitted to the Meeting to-morrow evening.”

I think the Resolutions are rather contradictory.

The Rev. JAMES KELLY.—I take it that the Resolution which we have now before us, is merely an equivalent to that which has just been read. They who propose the one say, that they do not intend to rescind the other.

The Rev. W. BUNTING.—It appears to me, that the points of difference

are two. As to the proposal for adjourning the taking of any steps, in that I should be able to concur. Does Dr. Halley imagine, that we resolved last night, *immediately* to memorialise Her Majesty (in the event of the House of Commons passing this measure) to dissolve Parliament? Our Resolution was, that we,—*in the event* of this Bill passing the House of Commons,—should *then* feel it our duty. Whenever that shall happen, it will *then* become our duty, —taking no action about it before. We do not anticipate; we do not tell our constituents, that we think this Bill will pass the Third Reading, and that they must be prepared for that event; but we simply say, taking no action in the interim, that *in the event* of this Bill passing the Third Reading, we shall feel it to be our duty to memorialise the Queen. The other point of difference is a rather more serious one. Dr. Halley thinks, that we should not only wait for the contingency of this Bill passing the Third Reading in the House of Commons; but for the contingency of its receiving an affirmative, in one stage at least, in the House of Lords. My first objection to that is an objection which I had resolved to postpone,—that the interval of time between the Third Reading in the House of Commons, and the period at which it could be advanced one stage in the House of Lords (assuming that we are not prepared to do anything in the interval of three weeks) must be so short, as not to allow of any step being taken. In the second place, I cannot forget, that you yourself proposed, on the eve of the Conference, at the suggestion of a distinguished individual, that we should forthwith memorialise Her Majesty; and that, when an objection was taken by the President of the Conference to our memorialising the Queen before the Bill had gone into the House of Lords, that objection was met by Mr. Seeley, and several other members of the Committee; and it was then ruled, on the eve of Conference (and in that ruling I must concur) that, in asserting that contingency, we ought not to be fettered by any reference to the House of Lords. It is perfectly competent to us, our own House having misrepresented us, to lay our grievances before the Throne,—leaving the House of Lords to do their duty.

The Rev. J. T. ROBINSON.—I beg very respectfully to submit to this religious Conference, that it should pause before it commits itself by a Resolution, to any course which may even have the appearance of anticipating the decision of a deliberative assembly, in which sit Ministers of the Gospel. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. Dr. HALLEY.—Would the Conference think it right, to adopt a Memorial to-night, and to go with it, cut and dried, to the Queen some weeks hence? (Hear.) You cannot, I contend, bring up a Memorial to-night, saying that, if the House of Commons should carry the Third Reading of the Bill, that Address to the Queen is to be passed a month hence?

Dr. Halley then read the Memorial,\* as it had been drawn up, and then proceeded:—

An Address to the Queen is to be submitted this evening, asking her to do

---

\* As this Memorial was never presented,—being entirely superseded by another, which was drawn up at a subsequent period,—it has not been considered necessary to insert it here.—EDITOR.

what? Why, asking that, should the House of Commons not reject this Bill on the Third Reading, she would dissolve Parliament; and then, after being kept somewhere for a month, it is to be carried, in a certain event, to the Queen. Now *we* propose a feasible measure,—and (as we think) the only measure for addressing the Queen respectfully and properly on the question. Without saying a word about the House of Lords, we say, if you address her Majesty at all, let there be a Memorial drawn up,—not one which she can receive upon a contingency, but one which can be presented upon a fact. (Hear, hear.) If it be necessary to call this Conference again together, let it be called together; and let the members come up, clothed with authority by their respective constituents,—which I confess I am not at present,—for this purpose. Let it be done with the consent of the constituents, and with the concurrence of all parties who have influence in Elections. Let us proceed carefully with this important measure, and do it at the right time, and in the right manner.

The Rev. J. FLETCHER, of Hanley.—Allow me to suggest a course, which may reconcile the two parties. Both parties might agree in altering the original Resolution. Circumstances have certainly altered; and it will not do to have the Memorial lying by for a month. We did not anticipate *that* yesterday, because we did not anticipate the month's interval. But I apprehend, that we ought to keep to the spirit of the Resolution of last night. Now we can very fairly put down in our minutes, that, under our altered circumstances, in the Resolution of last night the last clause shall be omitted. In that case it will be declared, that it is the judgment of this Meeting, that, in the event of the Bill passing the House of Commons, it will be the duty of the Country to petition the Queen. Let that stand as the amended Resolution, under the altered circumstances.

The Rev. R. THOMAS.—I think the proposal made by Mr. Fletcher is a very feasible one. I quite concur in it, and think that it will remove all difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN.—The decision of last night was, that a certain step should be taken in Exeter Hall; and that step must be taken unless the Resolution is altered. Perhaps (addressing Mr. Fletcher) you will reduce your Resolution to writing.

After a short interval, the Rev. Mr. Fletcher wrote down the Resolution, which he wished to propose, and read it to the Meeting.

The Rev. JABEZ BURNS, Baptist Minister.—I think there is still great force in the objection of Dr. Bunting, that the Members of the House of Lords should have an opportunity of protesting against this Bill; that, even supposing we would have Parliament dissolved, our friends in the House of Lords should have an opportunity of lifting up their voice against it. I think also, that her Majesty will have good reason for refusing the Memorial; because she may say, "You have not taken a constitutional course; by addressing *me* you have lost sight of the House of Lords; and it would have been time enough for this measure to be considered, when the House of Lords had expressed its opinion."

The Rev. WM. BEAN.—The object is not, if I understand it, that we should address the Queen, immediately on the Bill passing the Commons.

The Rev. JABEZ BURNS.—Yes, that is the object.

The Rev. J. FLETCHER.—I apprehend that, if any harm could be done, it has been done already. That Resolution has gone forth; and we have no right to alter the spirit of it. If the circumstances have been altered, we may suit our plan to those altered circumstances; but we must not stultify ourselves in the eyes of the public, of the House of Commons, and of all parties who look on our acts. We must not stultify ourselves by rescinding our Resolutions. I do not see, that we should stickle very much about the House of Peers deliberating. They can deliberate, and throw it out; we shall not hinder them. But,—if there is to be so little time between the Third Reading of this Bill in the House of Commons, and its actual enactment as a Law,—we ought to take the first step, after we know the judgment of the House of Commons; more especially as we all know, that the House of Peers are quite prepared to follow the House of Commons.

The CHAIRMAN.—It seems to me, that I may possibly throw a little light on this subject. It seems that between the Third Reading in the House of Commons and the First Reading in the House of Lords, there will be a short interval; and if, by allowing that short interval to pass, you can gain the constitutional point of being able to say, that you have not put aside the House of Lords, it will be well to do so. It is usual, or rather very common, for a Bill coming up from the House of Commons to be read a first time in the House of Lords *pro formâ*. Now, I think so important is this measure, that we may well say to the House of Lords, “We shall regard even the First Reading in your House as a proof of opposition to the feelings of the Country.” I think that is a fair compromise of the two opinions. If it be understood that by the First Reading we mean, not what is generally understood by it, the Second Reading; but that the moment after the First Reading, we shall consider the House of Lords as opposing our views,—then I think there will be a fair compromise on the question.

A DEPUTY.—Is it unconstitutional to request the Queen to dissolve Parliament, without waiting for the Bill to go into the House of Lords?

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—No; but I think it is contrary to the spirit of the Constitution, not to wait until one vote has been taken upon it.

A DEPUTY.—The first time there never is a vote.

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—A debate arose, and a discussion took place, on the First Reading of the Dissenters’ Chapels Bill.\*

The Rev. J. FLETCHER.—Unless there be some very weighty reason, we ought not to let the Third Reading pass. There is nothing unconstitutional in the course proposed. We can petition for a Dissolution of Parliament whenever we like; at least, I never read a line of history, indicating that it was unconstitutional to do so. If we find that the House of Commons

---

\* The distinction is, that when a Bill (like the Dissenters’ Chapels Bill) originates in the House of Lords, there may be a Debate and Division on the First Reading. When a Bill is brought up from the House of Commons, it is read the First Time as a matter of course.—EDITOR.

are not representing the body of their constituents, and have good proof of that in the disregard of the Petitions which are presented ; and if we have an assurance that the Bill will be enacted, as far as they are concerned ; then we can say to Her Majesty, " We are not represented." Thus in our Memorial we say, " This Bill is being passed, in spite of the almost unanimous opinion of the Country against it ; and we ask your Majesty, in mercy to us and to your land, to dissolve this Parliament."

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—The Queen must act through her advisers—(have you recollected that ?)—in such a matter as the Dissolution of Parliament ; and those advisers will be subject to the revision and animadversion of the next Parliament. Do not you give Sir Robert Peel and his Cabinet a great advantage, by not waiting to see the result, before you come to the Queen to dissolve Parliament ? I would not have spoken again on this subject,—because I have a great aversion to tenacity on minor points,—were I not perfectly satisfied, (speaking practically and looking to results,) that you are favouring the passing of this measure by adopting so premature a course ; and that it will be more in your favour, even in the House of Commons, to say, that you will wait until you see how the House of Lords shall proceed. Practically, I know the intentions of these gentlemen, and I like the spirit of what they propose ; and I do believe honestly, that you will be injuring the success of your own measures by taking a premature step.

The Rev. A. M. BROWN.—I fully agree with Mr. Fletcher, that the measure might not be unconstitutional ; but, at the same time, it might be considered uncourteous to the House of Lords. I know one nobleman who has been made a convert by the discussions of this Conference. Who is to say, that this Bill will not be rejected in the House of Lords ? and are we not then stultifying ourselves, by asking the Queen to dissolve Parliament, immediately after the Third Reading in the House of Commons. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. JAMES KELLY.—I only wish to make this one remark—there is no difference of principle amongst us. The only difference is this, that some of us are afraid of hazarding, by loss of time, a prompt response from the Country, if this measure should pass the House of Commons before any further step is taken. We are afraid of hazarding the loss of time, and you are afraid of being discourteous to the House of Lords. We have just to choose between these two alternatives. I do confess that, with all my disposition to show courtesy to the House of Lords, I lay a greater stress upon opposition to this measure.

The Rev. J. FLETCHER.—I am quite prepared to withdraw my motion, rather than divide the Meeting, because the Country can petition for the Dissolution of Parliament without our consent.

The motion of the Rev. Dr. Halley was then carried unanimously ; and the Conference adjourned at five o'clock, until Friday Morning at eleven.

## Fourth Sitting,

FRIDAY MORNING, MAY 2, 1845.

---

THE Deputies assembled at twelve o'clock this morning, in a room adjoining that in which the previous Meetings had been held.

Sir CULLING E. SMITH, Bart., was unanimously called to the Chair.

The Rev. H. PEAKE, of Abergavenny, opened the proceedings with prayer.

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, we have adjourned to this room, because we thought it more convenient to you to commence the proceedings here than in the large room. You are aware that our Methodist and Free Church friends are at present hearing the Annual Sermon; and we thought that, in their absence, we had better occupy this small room. We can easily adjourn into the other when they arrive. Gentlemen, I occupy a room in this house, which looks out on one of those steep streets which lead from the Strand to the river; and I was awakened this morning by some of the heavy coal-carts passing up from the river to the Strand. I heard the great dray-horses struggling up-hill, striving and sliding, and apparently for some time in vain. But then I heard the sound of the whip; and, with a great start, on went the coal-cart, and it reached the Strand. Gentlemen, I could not help thinking of the Anti-Maynooth Conference. (Hear, hear.) We have had a good deal of struggling and striving, to start our movements; but I think we are now well started, and I believe that the coal-cart will reach its destination. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, if I had any doubt on the subject; if I had any misgiving as to an ultimate success—that doubt and that misgiving would have been dispelled by the Meeting held last night. I have been for years in the habit of attending Meetings in Exeter Hall; but I never witnessed one, which, under all the circumstances,—its confinement to men, and the number of those men being so great,—I never witnessed anything, I say, which, under all the circumstances, was so remarkable. I wish to anticipate what I know is in the minds of a few of our friends. I wish to say, that it was not to be expected that a great Meeting of that sort, consisting of so many persons, addressed by so many speakers—and those speakers brought

together by peculiar circumstances for the first time—it was not to be expected, that, in a great Meeting like that, there should not be some few expressions which would jar. And it has been stated to me, that our friend Mr. Guthrie, who addressed us last night, was not quite considerate of the feelings of some of our friends connected with the Church of England. Well, my dear friends, we must give and take; and we must make great allowances for each other. If I had been appealed to as Chairman, I should have said, that he had better stop a little, and not put the Free Church movement on a parity with some things with which *he* did put it on a parity. But my view was, that there was a good-natured feeling among us all. (Cheers.) Ah! Gentlemen, notwithstanding some little things of that sort, there is a character about our movement which must have its effect on the public mind. I think our movement must have its effect on the Whig mind. (Hear, hear.) I sent this morning for that redoubtable book “Hansard;” but I am sorry to say, I have not yet had time to refer to passages, which I wished to find, in order to bring them before you; but I am quite convinced, that, if I have time in the course of the day to refer to the Debates on the Reform Bill—(you will trust me, Gentlemen, that I am not going to talk about political matters, on which we may not be agreed, but only on a matter of fact)—I am quite sure, that, if I have time, in the course of the day, to refer to this book, I shall find passages from my Lord John Russell’s speeches, and other speeches, in which it is laid down as a general principle, that, when the sentiments of a Country are distinctly declared, it is wrong and impolitic to resist those sentiments. (Hear, hear.) Now then, Gentlemen, I call upon those, with whose general outline of policy, whether right or wrong, I agree;—I call on those who have hitherto styled themselves, *par excellence*, the Liberal party, to act on their own principles. And,—as Lord John Russell, for instance, at the time of that great effervescence respecting Reform, appealed to popular feelings, and put himself at the head of the popular party,—so I appeal to them, if they do not mean to be inconsistent—if they do not mean that their conduct and professions in 1845 should contradict their conduct and professions in 1832—I call on them to yield *now*, as with it they coincided *then*, to the unquestionably declared popular feeling of this Country. Gentlemen, having made these observations as to political parties, allow me to say a little as to myself. Oh, my dear friends, if our Conference should break up, or rather adjourn, (for that is the word now,) (Hear, hear,) to-day or to-morrow, do let me entreat you, to carry down into the Country with you, and to diffuse, the same spirit that you have manifested in London. I would not, for the world, call upon any man to do that which he could not do conscientiously. If there are Dissenters who think—I totally disagree with them—but if there are those who think, that they cannot conscientiously act with Churchmen, I am sorry for what I consider their error; but I would not press them to act contrary to conscience. But, so far as their conscience will permit, I do implore of them, that, when they go back into the Country, they will, as far as possible, put in the back-ground those things which keep them apart from each other. With regard to Churchmen, if they will permit me to say so, in localities where Churchmen and Dissenters have not hitherto acted together, I would suggest, that, if they can conscien-

tiously do so, when they go back again,—instead of those two or three Dissenting, Methodist, and Church Meetings, which have been held before,—they should cordially combine to have a joint Meeting. (Hear, hear.) As I am speaking on the subject of devising Meetings, to be held when you return to the Country, allow me to remind you, Gentlemen, that one prominent question, to be brought before your friends then, is the contingency of appealing to the Queen about the Dissolution. Let me remind you—I know it is a work of supererogation—but let me remind you, that one of the principal things to be discussed, is, the proper steps to be taken in the view of a Dissolution; that, when our friends come up again, they may be armed with the advices and directions of their friends in the Country. Some of our friends in Manchester have resolved—and, as that is a leading place, it may be taken as an example to the Country—that one of the first subjects to be brought forward at their Public Meetings be the question of finance—the question of endeavouring to raise funds to sustain this great, but allow me again and again to say, this expensive movement in which we are engaged. We shall proceed, Gentlemen, to hear further reports from the Country,—giving, of course, the preference to those who represent the most important places, and who have also waited on Members of Parliament, and are able to state the result. And I would suggest, that if, for want of time, any of our friends who may wish to address us should not be able to do so, (we shall try to give them time;) and if any of our friends should not have time, I would request, that, before they leave London, they would send us written communications, as to the conferences which they had held with their respective Members. Allow me also to remind you, that one subject, which must be brought forward, is that important subject which we have already had before us—the propriety of inviting our friends to engage in united prayer. Now, there is a season coming, which a large proportion of our friends of the Established Church in this Country always regard as connected with the Out-pouring of the Holy Spirit; I mean Whitsuntide. And, without dictating to any one, I must say, that it does strike me, that it would be a delightful thing, if each section of the Christian Church could agree, that some day, about that time, should be chosen; on which we could all feel, that we were on our knees together, to ask the Out-pouring of the Holy Spirit. Gentlemen, I have only two more points to mention. One is, our meeting again in Committee, to consider matters which need not be discussed in the Conference at large. If this Conference breaks up in tolerable time this afternoon, it is proposed that the Committee should immediately adjourn into the adjoining room, for the transaction of business which need not be brought before you. But the most important question—which we propose that our friends shall consider whilst we are talking this morning—is, whether we shall meet again after to-day. Saturday is a day, on which many of our friends are anxious to return to the Country. I do not know whether a sufficient number will remain to form a Meeting: but all I can say is, that, as long as we can get enough of persons to form a Meeting, I shall be most happy to meet with them; and as long as there is any information to be given, it is desirable that it should be communicated to us. I would just say this in a parenthesis, that, if any of our friends like to meet to-morrow, our



friends connected with the press will report the proceedings, just as much when only forty are present, as when there are four hundred. It appears to me, that, if a tolerable number of persons are ready to meet, it is desirable that they should do so. However, that is a matter for your consideration. Before I call on any Gentlemen from the different places to address you, I will read a letter which I have received from a Member of Parliament—Mr. Cumming Bruce.

After the letter had been read, the Chairman called upon

The Rev. JAMES LEECHMAN, Baptist Minister, from Ayrshire.—It is not my intention to occupy the time of the Meeting at any length. I have been appointed as the representative of the Ministers and Office-Bearers of about twelve Congregations in the West of Scotland; those congregations being made up of the Free Church, the Secession, the Relief Church, the Independents, the Original Seceders, and the Baptists. There was the greatest cordiality and harmony in our Meeting; and, although perhaps I was the greatest Voluntary there, they unanimously appointed me to come to this Conference as their Deputy. When I mention to the Meeting who is my Colleague, I am sure every person present will regret that he is not here to address you this morning. That Colleague is the Hon. Mr. Bouverie, the Member for Kilmarnock. (Cheers.) As soon as I arrived in Town, I called on Mr. Bouverie; and he requested me to say, that, if he possibly could, he would attend the proceedings of the Conference. I have only further to mention, that I have waited on our Representative, Lord James Stuart, who had voted in favour of the measure, against the opinion of the large majority of his Constituents. I mentioned to his Lordship, that I did not know one individual who was in favour of this measure; that the Presbytery of Irvine had petitioned against it; and that I was sent up by a very large portion of his supporters. His Lordship said, There is one person in the town who opposes you. (Laughter.) I was not aware that there was one: however, he named one person in our town, who was in favour of this Grant. His Lordship mentioned also, that there had been a requisition signed in the Highlands of Scotland. In reply to his Lordship, I stated, that a large majority of his Constituents had written up to his Lordship on the subject. He declared, however, that he would still persevere. He would not consent to absent himself from the Third Reading. His chief argument on this occasion was—"I have voted with the chief Statesmen on both sides of the House; and I feel that I am bound in conscience to continue to do so."

In consequence of a great number of Deputies having arrived since the commencement of the business, the Conference adjourned to the larger room, which had been occupied for the proceedings on the previous days.

On the business of the Conference being resumed,—

The CHAIRMAN said—Gentlemen, I have found the report of the proceedings in Parliament, on the first of March, 1831; and Lord John Russell then said:—"Sir, the question is not one of sedition or of numerical strength, but whether, without some large measure of Reform, we can carry on the affairs of the Country, with the confidence and support of the people? This House, even in its unreformed state, has had nothing to look to but the confidence, support, and sympathy of the Nation. It is quite clear that, if you

refuse Reform, that sympathy and confidence will in future be withdrawn. I ask you then, whether when the people out of doors, by multitudes of Petitions, are calling for Reform, the House of Commons should say—‘We alone are the judges of our own purity—we despise the warning voice of the people whom we profess to represent’ ” ?

Mr. WILLIAM BROWN CARTER, from Nottingham.—Sir, you want facts, and I shall endeavour to give you a few. Nottingham is distinguished for high political feeling. The political parties—the mere politicians of Nottingham—are either decidedly against us, or indifferent to the question altogether. The high Churchmen are, generally speaking, in favour of the Maynooth Bill. One of the Evangelical Clergymen thinks, that it is a question which ought to be decided by the Executive Government, and that we should leave its decision with the Government alone, and not interfere with such a question at all. I believe that the other Evangelical Clergymen are on our side. The Dissenting Ministers, of all Denominations, are with us; the Socinian body are neutral; a few individuals of the Dissenters only are either indifferent to the question, or partially favourable to the Grant as a liberal measure towards Ireland. I believe I may consider myself as the representative of the Wesleyan Community of Nottingham—one circuit of it particularly. In the absence of the two Clergymen,—who were present on the first day of the Meeting in this Hall, but who were obliged to return to their clerical duties on the second day,—permit me to say, that those two Clergymen had been deputed to represent the Protestant Operative Association of Nottingham, with which I have the honour to be connected. Indeed, I believe it is partly attributable to that circumstance, that I occupy my present position. It has happened to me to come into contact with Popery. I have smelt the gunpowder of Popery, and have felt a little of the shock of its artillery. (Laughter.) The Wesleyan Ministers and Office-bearers, male and female, old and young, who are capable of thinking at all on the subject, are to an individual opposed to the Maynooth Grant, as a piece of Popish policy which the British Constitution cannot tolerate, and retain its integrity; and which the British people ought not to sanction. On the very day when your Committee in London issued the Document, by which your Conference was convened, the Office-bearers of Nottingham held a Meeting, in which they passed a series of Resolutions in reference to this question; and I beg to say, that the Resolution which I am about to read has received the signatures of between seventy and eighty official Members of the Wesleyan Methodist Society in Nottingham,—every one of whom has a vote, and some of whom are freeholders of the County.

Mr. Carter then read the Fourth Resolution passed at the Meeting at Nottingham, referring to the jeopardy in which our rights and liberties are now placed.

I said that this Resolution had received the signatures of seventy or eighty official Members; but I believe there is not a man in our Society who, on serious reflection, would not attach his name to it. A Committee was formed, consisting of all Denominations in Nottingham. The gentleman who was deputed by the Central Committee in London, the Rev. Mr. Tyler, put himself in communication with the Ministers and Churches

in different parts of the Country. In consequence of the shortness of time, the correspondence was not very extensive; but I have no doubt that, when these proceedings are known, there will be a considerable correspondence between the Committee and the County of Nottingham. Perhaps it behoves me now to state the result of an interview held with one of our Members. We went to the residence of Mr. Gisborne; but were not so fortunate as to find him at home,—that gentleman being now in the Country, on a visit to his afflicted father. We have, however, corresponded with him, and, from the tenor of his reply, we have reason to believe that he will vote against the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN.—Has he not voted for it?

A DEPUTY.—No; he has not voted at all.

Mr. W. B. CARTER.—We had an interview with the other Member, who was a Member of the late administration,—I mean Sir John Cam Hobhouse. (Hear, hear.) We were received by him with the greatest courtesy, and treated in the most gentlemanly manner. He listened to us with the most perfect deference. We held a conversation with him of full half-an-hour's duration. As to the result of that interview, I should observe, that Sir John Cam Hobhouse was perfectly cautious, although perfectly frank. (Laughter.) He alluded to what had occurred recently in the House of Commons, with regard to some statement which had been published, in reference to a conversation which had taken place two or three years ago with Sir Robert Peel; and he said, that he would not wish to be himself placed in a similar predicament to that of the Premier. We felt bound to pledge ourselves, that nothing should result from an interview with him, from which any future unpleasantness could arise; and by that pledge we feel called upon to abide. Still I think I may state the substance of the interview with perfect honour. Sir John's opinion is, that statesmen have to deal with facts rather than with opinions. He said, "It is a fact that Ireland is Catholic, and Ireland therefore must be treated as being Catholic." In his opinion, it is impossible to govern Ireland, whatever Party may be in power, on any other policy than that on which the Bill in favour of Maynooth is based. I think I need not state more than that. I am requested to say, Sir Culling, that we have five or six Clergymen on our Committee at Nottingham, as well as several Dissenters.

The Rev. HUGH HUNTER, from Nottingham.—I am happy to say, Sir, that among the Protestant Dissenters of Nottingham, the most perfect unanimity exists on this subject. We have had Meetings in common in Nottingham; and, while alluding to that, I must say, that I have been highly delighted with the spirit manifested throughout the whole of this Conference. Permit me to say, that when Sir John Hobhouse stated, that this Grant was for the Education of the people of Ireland, I told him, that I believed he and many others, who entertained that opinion, were under a gross mistake; that I was connected with a large body of Evangelical Dissenters in Nottingham, and I did not believe that, if a Grant had been proposed by Government for the education of the minds of Ireland, a single individual among his Constituents would have held up his hand against it. This Grant, I said, was for the Education of young men to teach Doctrines in direct opposition to the Word of God;—young men, who were not to seek the general instruc-

tion of the people of Ireland, but to educate the people in a system directly opposed to the Word of God, and to all those efforts which Protestants of various Denominations are making for the instruction and evangelization of that Country. (Hear, hear.) I told Sir John, that, with very few exceptions, the whole of his constituents were against him. He said, he was aware of it. I told him, that, if he persevered, it was very likely that we should not send him again to Parliament, but return a person who would represent our views and feelings on this great question, and on every other religious question, especially connected with the spiritual welfare of this Country. We did not like, I told him, to pay for the education of young men to teach Popery, to teach a system which we believed to be in direct opposition to the Word of God. He said, he could not help it; he must be consistent. "Well," I said, "Sir John, you can stay away." He replied, "I do not know about that." I do think that there is a misgiving in certain quarters in connexion with this question, and I rejoice to see it.

The Rev. S. NICHOLSON, from Plymouth.—I beg to represent to this Meeting the result of an interview, which I and my colleague have had with Lord Ebrington. His Lordship was furnished beforehand with our sentiments, in the form of a letter, proceeding from a numerous body of his constituents, expressive of their views. His Lordship adverted to one sentence of the letter, to which I shall take the liberty to refer. "In addressing your Lordship as a supporter of the Establishment principle, we feel justified in putting it to you, whether the Truth and Divine authority of the selected and endowed system are henceforth to be virtually surrendered? If, as it has often been asserted, the support of the *true Religion* be a national tribute to its Divine Author, we earnestly ask, whether He can approve the homage which is professedly rendered to the Protestant Faith, when, from the same resources, is dealt out a legislative contribution to Popery? The latter system Protestants believe that God has censured, and will destroy. We therefore regard, with mingled astonishment and grief, your vote in its favour." Permit me to remind the Meeting, that this is merely an *argumentum ad hominem*; and does not express that the theory is advocated in the letter. I submit, Sir, that neither our astonishment nor our grief, upon the premises, was misplaced. His Lordship seemed partially to have misunderstood us, as if we meant to impute to him political inconsistency. We meant no such thing. The astonishment relates simply to the fact of his voting for Popery, though we believed him to be a firm and conscientious Protestant. He stated, that he must support the measure, as being part of what was due to Ireland, on account of the wrongs which she had sustained; and that he felt, that, in contributing to the support of Popery, and in voting for the payment of money from the national resources for that purpose, he did but regard himself as voting it for one form of Christianity. It was of no use, that we suggested to his Lordship the infallibility which Popery claimed, and its anathematizing spirit; and therefore, that, in supporting it, he was virtually supporting a church which excluded all other Christians from salvation. He did not even give us a hope, that he would be silent on the Third Reading. We submitted, that, inasmuch as a case had arisen, which was not contemplated by his constituents when they sent him to Parliament—a case on which

his convictions were in the highest degree opposed to ours—he could not deem himself to be acting an unworthy part by remaining silent. He intimated, that he should feel it a dereliction of duty ; and we, of course, left his Lordship to follow out his own course. Allow me to make one suggestion, which may be useful for the guidance of the Conference. His Lordship alluded to certain expressions, which had met his eye as having been used at the Meeting last evening. It is quite out of order for me to refer to those expressions ; but I only wish to submit, that the best possible way of preparing for dealing with our Legislators, of all parties, is, most carefully to abstain from everything which has a tendency to irritate. I might throw the whole of this assembly into an uproar, if I were to say all that I conscientiously believed ; but I think a man may prudentially refrain from saying all he thinks. Allow me to say one word in conclusion. The Committee did me the honour to name me as one of the Conference secretaries. As I shall shortly be obliged to return home, I beg now to say farewell, and to return my appointment into the hands of the Committee, devoutly imploring for it, in the important matters which yet await its decision and practical operation,—particularly with regard to the Address to the People of Ireland, that they may be directed by the wisdom which cometh from above, and that there may be nothing done, but what will tend to harmonise all parties, and to conciliate those, whose temporal and spiritual welfare we ought to have at heart. In one short sentence, I would sum up, by saying, “The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.”

The Rev. J. D. CRIGHTON, from Arbroath.—I beg to say, that we had an interview with our Representative yesterday morning. His name is well known here, and all over the Empire—Joseph Hume. (Laughter.) Montrose consists of four Boroughs ; Arbroath is one of them ; and they are all represented by Mr. Hume. Mr. Sorley and myself were received with the utmost courtesy ; and Mr. Hume listened, as far as the limited time would permit, with patience to what we had to say,—telling us, at the very outset, however, that we were grievously mistaken, and did not understand the matter at all. It struck me, that Mr. Hume participated in the feeling,—which seems to be very common among our Members of Parliament at present,—that the Electors at the last Election were singularly discriminating ; and selected, in every place, a man far wiser than themselves. (Laughter.) We have now, in the House of Commons, the benefit of the concentrated wisdom of the Country. These Gentlemen, when they advocate a measure, declare at the same time, that they know we are against it ; which seems very much like saying, “We are the men, and wisdom will die with us. The Nation knows nothing about the matter ; we do understand it, and we will save the Nation from itself.” The Rev. Mr. Sorley and myself took the opportunity of putting in our “ifs” and “buts,” to show that we and our people were not so ignorant and besotted as some Members of Parliament imagined. I will venture to say, that there are persons in our Town little above the working classes, who have more enlightened and just views on this question than many Members of Parliament. (Cheers.) Mr. Hume told us, that he was only acting consistently in voting for this Bill ; for he had, at some period or other, advocated the Endowment of Hindooism on the same

principle. (Laughter.) This was a great admission indeed. The arguments for the Endowment of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, in Ireland, would certainly lead to the Endowment of Hindooism in India. Mr. Hume said, he regarded it as an Educational Measure. Now I beg to say, that I have been much interested in Education myself; and, if it were simply the Education of the People that was intended, I would not be the man to oppose it. But I took the liberty of saying to him, that it was not the Education of the people, but of the Irish Priesthood. Mr. Hume would not grant that. He said, that the College of Maynooth was open to all, and that it was their own fault if they did not avail themselves of it. And he mentioned some case of a gentleman being educated there, and afterwards adopting a different profession. Now I have made some inquiry into this matter since, and I understand, that the regulations of that Seminary are such, that those who are brought up in it are expressly educated for the Priesthood, whether they finally enter into the Priesthood or not. I say, that the College is therefore for the Education of the Priesthood. We did not succeed in making any impression on our Representative. He exhibited the greatest candour; he did not blink the matter in the slightest degree; but he said, he was bound to support this measure. We made him aware of the strong feeling which existed in the Borough on the subject.

Sir, we have had several public Meetings in reference to this question, and all who were present agree, that they were the most cordial and enthusiastic that they ever witnessed in that Town. Sir, there are comparatively few Dissenters from Scotland; but I assure you, that this is only owing to the great distance, and to the circumstance of our being a poor people, and not able to pay the expense. It is not owing to any want of feeling on this subject. I venture to say, that there is no part of the British Empire where there is a more strong and determined opposition to Popery, and to this measure in particular, than in the district, and throughout the land, to which I belong. A gentleman said in my hearing this morning, that there were not many Members of the Free Church in the Conference. I believe, Sir, that the reason is, that our attention has been so much directed to other subjects, that we cannot very well be spared from home at present; we have so many vacancies. It is not because our hearts are not interested; for they are among the warmest in reference to this matter. I was sent here, along with my reverend friend, not so much in the hope that this measure would be prevented from passing,—though I am glad to say that this hope has been somewhat brightened since I came to London,—as because our people were anxious to know what could be done, in case the measure should be passed by Parliament. They will be disappointed, and I shall be disappointed as one of their Deputies, if this Meeting should prove to have been a mere ebullition of feeling. We shall be disappointed, unless you devise a central system, the ramifications of which will extend throughout the Country, and keep alive this feeling. And, Sir, the Resolution, which I had the honour to propose at a Public Meeting, referred to what we were to do when the measure should be passed; and I can assure you, that the spear which some Honourable Member of Parliament referred to,—complaining that the spear wielded by John Knox was not allowed to rust,—I can assure you, that that spear

will still be wielded. (Cheers.) Sir, I hope that there is a feeling among the Protestants in this Country, which will never allow that spear to rust. Is it meant, that we should give up the principles for which John Knox contended? or are we to be more courteous than he was? We can see, in the distance, the place where John Knox preached, and the place where Wishart was burned at the stake. We have the same spirit by which they were animated; and we will never yield to Popery. (Cheers.)

The Rev. A. SORLEY, from Arbroath.—I take the liberty of supplying one omission on the part of my friend who has just spoken. In our interview with Mr. Hume, he said, "You are come up to attend this Anti-Maynooth Conference?" I said, "Yes, Sir." He said, "What have you been about?" We replied—that we had been occupied in hearing reports as to the state of feeling in different parts of the Country; and, last night, in passing Resolutions. "Resolutions! of what import?" said he. I said, "Sir, there was one Resolution which I may mention especially:—the Resolution expressive of disapprobation of the conduct of Sir Robert Peel, in refusing to receive a Deputation from this Conference; and that I never beheld such a righteous indignation as was manifested in passing that Resolution." Now I wish the Meeting to attend to what I am about to tell them. "Why," he said, "Sir Robert Peel has been very ill used. Some half-dozen years ago, he had an interview with a certain Dr. Buchanan; and Dr. Buchanan now reminds Sir Robert Peel of what transpired in that interview." (Laughter.) So that the great reason for Sir Robert Peel's refusal is, that Clergymen have too long memories; and, if this Conference wish for an interview with Sir Robert Peel, they must send a few out of their number, who have very short memories, and who will soon forget what transpired in the interview. (Laughter.) The great object of this Conference has been, to bring out the state of feeling in different parts of the Country. Now there is one thing calculated to show the state of feeling throughout the Country—it has not been sufficiently adverted to; I refer to the fact, that there are so many Deputies from Scotland attending this Conference. Sir, it is a very decided expression of opinion, that so many Gentlemen are here from the various towns of England; it is also a decided expression of opinion, that so many Gentlemen are here from Wales: but by far the strongest expression of feeling is, that we have in this Conference so many Deputies from Scotland. (Cheers.) But for the deep feeling that pervades that Country, you would not have a single Deputy here. It should be borne in mind, that the time which we have had for coming has been very short indeed: and I desire exceedingly that, if the Conference should not have time to hear the whole of the Deputies from Scotland, this point should be brought before the Public with sufficient distinctness, namely—that we have here Deputies from the extreme West of Scotland, from the extreme North of Scotland, and of course from the East of Scotland.

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, a communication of some importance will be made to you; on account of which, the hearing of Representatives from different places will for a short time be suspended.

The Rev. TRESHAM D. GREGG.—Mr. Chairman, I have had communication with a great number of Members of Parliament with reference to this

Bill; and it is my feeling—it is the feeling of the Deputation which accompanies me from Ireland,—it is the feeling of very many English brethren, that we must immediately do something—something that is practical, in order to impede the progress of the Bill. (Hear, hear.) This Bill has been announced by Sir Robert Peel, as about to pass through Committee this very night; which implies, if I mistake not, that there is to be no further discussion on its details. The Third Reading merely is postponed till the 19th; which admits of no discussion of the details, but merely the general principle. Consequently it seems to me, and to the friends whom I met with and have consulted, that this is a most important moment in the progress of our movement. (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen, what we want to do,—since the principle of the Bill is unhappily affirmed, and it has positively been voted by the House of Commons, that the public money is to be given for the permanent Establishment of the College of Maynooth;—what we want is, to suggest to the Members who represent us in Parliament, distinct amendments—with the object of liberalizing and opening the Institution, and thus destroying its inquisitorial and monastic character. The adoption of these Amendments would be most important, as it would probably render the Bill unacceptable; and a number of friends, in connexion with ourselves, have drawn up a series of amendments, which it will not take me long to read. Some of them are suited for Churchmen; some of them are suited for Dissenters; some for Tories; some for Liberals:—all of them are suited for Protestants. Let each man choose an Amendment, one or more, for himself; and let him take it to his Representative, and say, “Enter that in the books to-night, and let it be discussed and divided upon, before the Bill passes through Committee.” Gentlemen, this will give us time. What is done to-night may be fatal. Let us, therefore, endeavour to procrastinate as much as possible. We have heads and hearts enough here, to conceive amendments, that will keep the Bill in Committee for the next six months. Gentlemen, I trust that I shall not weary your attention, by referring you to the Bill itself. Its Preamble is this: “A Bill to amend the two Acts passed in Ireland for the better Education of Persons professing the Roman Catholic Religion, and for the better Government of the Seminary established at Maynooth,” &c.

The CHAIRMAN.—I beg your pardon; that is the Title, not the Preamble.

The Rev. T. D. GREGG.—Well, then, in the very title, I would propose an “Amendment: to open the said College for the secular instruction of the public in general;” the object being to guard against the danger likely to arise from the exclusive inculcation of Popish principles. I was delighted to hear a late speaker say, that he had no objection to a measure of General Education. The Bill does nothing for General Education. In the fourth clause provision is made for the salaries of Officers and Professors, and an increased number of Professors; and I think this would be a suitable place to introduce a clause, embodying the principle of that part of the Title which I have just read; and consequently I would suggest the following Amendment, for such gentlemen as choose to take it to their Representatives. Observe, Mr. Chairman, I do not say let them copy this Amendment; but let them take the spirit of it. “And whereas, at the time of the Union, the said College was entirely open to Roman Catholics; and whereas a considerable portion of the instruc-



tion given therein must necessarily consist of secular learning, &c. ; be it therefore enacted, that Students of all Denominations be admitted to the said College, in order to profit by the said instruction ; provided always that they shall be exempted from all attendance on Theological Lectures and on any portion of the Roman Catholic instruction." Gentlemen, I beg to suggest, that *that* is the very principle which Mr. Sheil is contending for with regard to Oxford and Cambridge. If, then, we establish a College for Roman Catholics, why should it not be thrown open to Protestants ? If through this Amendment, the Bill be defeated, we shall gain our object. The next clause is a clause providing for 500 Students. To that I would add, a proviso to the effect "that of the 250 additional free Students, fifty at the least should belong to the Protestant Churches, should so many apply for admission."

The Rev. Dr. REED.—Mr. Chairman, might we not redeem time ? We all wish, by every Constitutional method, to destroy the Bill ; and it strikes me, that the suggestion of our friend is exceedingly good ; but the only way open for us to carry it into effect would be, to request certain Gentlemen of this body, to wait upon those Members who are already pledged, more or less, to the course which is suggested. We could name some dozen friends in the House of Commons, who are prepared, and who have said that they are prepared, by such Amendments, to postpone the Bill. The practical course would be, for some half-dozen of us to get into carriages, and go from this Body, and request them from us, to do their utmost to effect this object.

The CHAIRMAN.—It occurs to me, that the practicable course would be, for Mr. Gregg, Mr. Blackburn, and one or two other Gentlemen to retire into the Committee-room ; and to inquire what Members might be most advantageously asked to take these steps ?

The Rev. T. POWELL, Wesleyan Minister, from Doncaster.—I am very fearful lest the Conference should commit itself on a point of great importance,—implying that some modification of that Bill will be approved by this Conference. The Bill is too bad to be amended ; but, if we propose Amendments in it, we shall be committed to a partial approval of its Principle.

The Rev. C. PREST.—The suggestion which you have made, Sir, is I think a good one. Perhaps there would be some difficulty in proposing these Amendments in the Conference. Some Gentlemen had better retire at once. The Conference, no doubt, will think, that the best thing that could be done is to defeat the Bill altogether : but, if good service can be rendered, by acting on Mr. Gregg's suggestion, it should be done at once.

The Rev. T. D. GREGG.—Mr. Chairman, I am in the hands of the Meeting. By your consent, I rose to propose a certain course. I trust I have not violated order, or in the least degree hurt the feelings of any Gentleman. (Hear, hear.) I beg to say, that I am far from violating the maxim laid down by the Reverend Gentleman who has just spoken. I would protest against these Amendments compromising us into the acceptance of the Principle. I conceive that Providence has put the opportunity into our hands, of defeating the Bill by these measures ; and it was with that purpose, and with that view, that I proposed them. This is not doing evil that good may come ; for in truth the Amendments are valuable in themselves. The Resolution which I would found on the Amendments is this :—

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, I feel quite sure, that I can anticipate the feelings of a large proportion of those whom I am addressing. Anything like a Resolution to amend the Institution would be something like the admission of the Principle. (Hear, hear.) And I don't think it would be consistent with our position, as an Anti-Maynooth Conference, to imply that we could tolerate or sanction the Institution at all. (Hear, hear.) I think if you (addressing Mr. Gregg) would be so kind as to retire, with two or three Gentlemen, and consult with them, it might then be arranged, that you and they should go, with the Amendments, to certain Members of Parliament.

The Rev. J. BLACKBURN.—Allow me to say, that I have gone over these Amendments, and I think they are exceedingly well done to embarrass the Bill. But they involve principles which it is utterly impossible to bring before the Conference. Some of them are such as I could subscribe, and some of them are such as I could not subscribe. Therefore I submit, that we could not enter into them *here*, though it is desirable that we should avail ourselves of Mr. Gregg's suggestion.

The Rev. G. B. KIDD, from Scarborough.—I beg to suggest to the Gentlemen who are about to retire, that, if they amend the Bill, they should amend it so, that not one penny will be given to a Roman Catholic Institution, for any crucifix, or for anything which sanctions idolatry. (Hear, hear.) Unless they can make the Bill free from this objection, I should strongly object to their pursuing such a course. I would beg to inquire, whether, in the history of Parliamentary proceedings, it has ever been known, that a Minister has appointed a certain day for an obnoxious measure to be read, and has then taken the Reading fourteen days before? If such a thing is unprecedented, I think we should not expect Sir Robert Peel to resort to it. This being the case, shall we not be making our proceedings obnoxious to the Country at large, by taking up the time of Parliament, and obstructing the private business, and other matters, by a movement, which some in this room do not consider to be necessary?

The Rev. T. D. GREGG.—I rise to order. I think that the gentleman is not speaking to the question.

The Rev. G. B. KIDD.—I think I am speaking to the question. If there is any Gentleman in the room who has sat in Parliament, or who has closely watched Parliamentary proceedings, I would submit the point to him.

The Rev. W. BUNTING.—Sir Culling, I exceedingly deprecate further discussion on this subject. It would never be decided in a large Meeting like this. I beg leave, therefore, to move, that a Committee be appointed to confer with Mr. Gregg on this subject. I do hope that, if Gentlemen do not agree with us, they will, for the sake of united action, and of preserving that which to us is of unspeakable moment, allow the matter to pass. I will nominate with your permission, the Rev. James Kelly, the Rev. W. M'Ilvaine, the Rev. A. S. Thelwall, &c.

The Rev. T. D. GREGG.—I beg to second the Resolution.

The Rev. T. POWELL.—I feel that we are now at a very important point. I should be the last person to throw anything in the way of expedition in business; but I cannot, on any account, flinch from opposing our taking any part, that may get us into a difficulty out of which we may never escape.

Upon the point before us, permit me to say, that I should suggest the addition of some other persons.

The CHAIRMAN.—Does your objection refer to the nomination of a Committee at all, or to the persons appointed?

The Rev. T. POWELL.—To both.

The CHAIRMAN.—Then first address yourself, if you please, to the question of nominating the Committee.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—I would beg to propose, that the Rev. Mr. Powell be added to the Committee. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. W. VEVERS.—I would beg to remind the Meeting, that Mr. Gregg is only carrying out the principle recommended by Mr. M'Neile, to which the Meeting responded—that the Conference were bound to adopt every plan, however apparently factious, for the purpose of procuring the rejection of the Bill. I think our thanks are due to Mr. Gregg for bringing this matter forward.

G. R. PAUL, Esq., of Stroud.—There seems to be a slight misunderstanding. My friend was right in supposing, that the Third Reading of the Bill is postponed until the 19th of May; but previously it must pass through Committee, and that is to be done to-night. (Hear, hear.) Our object is, to prevent its passing to-night through the only stage of which Sir Robert Peel is afraid. He is afraid of the details. (Hear, hear.) The moment you go into details, his party is of such a heterogeneous nature, that it immediately breaks up. It is such a hydra-headed monster, that it must immediately dissolve itself, and break, by being divided into different sections. (Hear, hear.) I hope and trust that, whatever Amendments may be brought forward, it will not be lost sight of, that the Principle upon which we all stand here as Protestants is, that of refusing all Grants to Romanism; and—although Amendments may be formed, which have a tendency to liberalize Maynooth College—yet, if this course will have a tendency to take money from our pockets, for a Religion which we believe to be superstitious and idolatrous, it cannot be pursued. As a Protestant Conference, we refuse to countenance the Maynooth Grant at all. I trust, that this will not be forgotten in any Amendment which may be proposed.

The Rev. JABEZ BURNS.—I consider this a very critical juncture in our sitting. If we take a single step in the direction now proposed, we shall be committing ourselves; and I, for one, protest against any such step being taken. At present we stand right with the whole Nation; and the Nation is not prepared to go into the intricacies of our movement. If this course be taken, let it be taken by Mr. Gregg, and others who sympathise with him. We shall heartily rejoice, if any method can be adopted of delaying, or preventing the passing of the Bill; but I entreat the Conference not to take a single step in this matter.

The Rev. W. BUNTING read the names of the proposed Committee; and after doing so, said—“And if you please (addressing that gentleman) Mr. Burns?”

The Rev. JABEZ BURNS.—No; I beg leave to move, as an Amendment, that we take no step in this matter.

A DEPUTY.—I beg to second that Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, it strikes me that no step ought to be taken by this Conference, in which we are not unanimous. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, even although a considerable proportion of our number desire the appointment of the Committee; yet, if any object, we should hesitate before we appoint it. And perhaps the same object would be accomplished, if the individuals who have been named were to retire, in order that, without any responsibility on our part, this matter may be considered and determined. (Hear, hear.)

The motion was then withdrawn, and several Gentlemen retired from the Conference, to reassemble in another room.

The Rev. JAMES KELLY, of the Established Church.—I trust, Mr. Chairman, that though we decline, as a body of Deputies, to identify ourselves with this movement, yet amongst us, Mr. Gregg and his friends, who have now retired, will find most anxious co-operators. Some may co-operate most ardently and effectually, notwithstanding what has occurred.

The Rev. Mr. MAXWELL.—Along with an esteemed friend, who has, with me, been deputed by the Wesleyan Methodists of Cambridge to attend this Conference, I waited upon the Honourable Manners Sutton at the Home Office this morning; and I feel it to be a duty which I owe to that Gentleman to say, that, throughout the whole of our interview with him on this business, he treated us with the greatest courtesy and kindness. From what I have seen of that Honourable Gentleman, I should say, he is one of the most amiable men in the world. The Honourable Gentleman asked us, on what ground we opposed the Endowment of Popery?—whether we took the Voluntary principle? I replied, that we did not, as Wesleyan Methodists, take the Voluntary Principle; but that we opposed the Endowment of Popery on two principles. The first principle was this, that we believed the Church of Rome to be superstitious and idolatrous, and that therefore we strongly objected to afford any support to such a system. The Honourable Gentleman said, he could not go quite so far with us as to say, that the Church of Rome was superstitious and idolatrous;—he was not prepared to say, that every Roman Catholic was an Idolater. To this I ventured to reply, that we were not prepared to say, that every Roman Catholic was an Idolater; but that we opposed the Endowment of the System—that we looked upon the Romish System as superstitious and idolatrous. He observed, that there were many things which we held in common: to which our reply was, that we could not support the things held in common, without supporting those which were not held in common—that, if you endowed Popery at all, you must endow the whole. We said that, as Wesleyan Methodists, we felt quite ready to do anything in our power for the amelioration of the state of Ireland; but we take our stand on Christian principle, and were determined not to yield. The Honourable Gentleman observed, that, in the present state of Ireland, it might be expedient to endow—

The CHAIRMAN.—I would suggest, that it will not be well for the Gentleman to go into full argument between himself and the Member, but only to state the results.

The Rev. Mr. MAXWELL.—Allow me to say, then, without offering any comment, that the other principle upon which we took our stand was this—

(laughter)—that Her Majesty's Government, in endowing Popery, were departing from the great Protestant principles recognised as an essential part of the Constitution of the United Kingdom. As to the result, I am sorry to say, the Honourable Gentleman did not at all see the matter as we did. (Laughter.) I may be allowed to state, that the Wesleyan Methodists of Cambridge are alive to the great importance of this question. Perhaps I may be permitted to refer to an expression, which has been uttered more than once in this Conference—I mean "the ignorant Methodists." (Cries of "No, no.")

The CHAIRMAN.—I would suggest that that question should not be gone into; but that the Gentleman should rather confine himself to the result of the interview.

The Rev. Mr. MAXWELL.—The result of that interview is, I am sorry to say, that the Honourable Manners Sutton is not with us upon this question.

The Rev. H. PEAKE, from Abergavenny.—I intend to deal with facts. The first fact which I shall state is, that the spirit of the Town of Abergavenny, and of the whole of Monmouthshire, is decidedly Anti-Maynooth and Anti-Popish. Long before any communication from London reached our distant part of the land, we had commenced and finished our proceedings with regard to Petitions. My personal feelings were roused; and the moment I heard of the proposal for the Endowment of Maynooth, I set about consulting the feelings of those around me, including my Dissenting Brethren in the Ministry; and they responded to my appeal. I first called upon the Independent Minister to unite with me; then I called upon the Baptist Minister; and then upon the Wesleyan Minister. They said, "Our hearts are with you;" and the names of all were appended to our Petition. Although so few are here from Wales, I assure you it is not from any want of earnestness in the cause. I can speak to ninety Clergymen in the Principality, who are all opposed to this Grant. Mr. Blewitt has voted with us upon this question.

The CHAIRMAN.—Although a Roman Catholic?

The Rev. H. PEAKE.—Yes, he is. He has voted against the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN.—Although a Roman Catholic?

The Rev. H. PEAKE.—I am not quite sure of that fact. Yesterday morning, we waited upon Mr. Octavius Morgan, who said, that, on considering the matter, he had come to the determination not to vote at all. At first the Deputation felt satisfied with that declaration; but I could not help telling him, that many of the persons whom we represent had said to me, "It will not do for Gentlemen, on such a question as this, to remain neuter; he that is not with us is against us." I could not help informing him, that this had been said by different persons of different sects. We went from Mr. Morgan, as in duty bound, to Lord Granville Somerset. (Laughter.) We had not an opportunity of personally impressing upon his Lordship our views in an interview, as he was laid up with the gout; but we sat down and wrote a protest, in which we ventured to tell him, that nothing but a doubt of the depth and sincerity of our feelings on this subject, or of the feelings

which pervaded the public mind in Great Britain, could sustain any man, in venturing to oppose the opinions of the thousands that are opposed to this Bill.

The Rev. H. BURN, Independent Minister, of Abergavenny.—Not only am I here, Sir, from a congregation of Ancient Britons ; but I am here likewise as the Representative of the Ministers and Churches of the County of Monmouth. If I were to give you their names at full, I should say, that they are Protestant Dissenters ; but it is sufficient to give the abbreviations, and to say, that they are Protestants. (Cheers.) Reference has been made to John Knox. I beg to say, that the spirit of Sir John Oldcastle is not only lurking about us, but it is the prevailing spirit. As well might any man attempt to remove our beautiful hills or mountains from their places, as aim at rooting out Protestantism from our hearts. It has been said, that the British lion should shake his mane. I say at all events, let him not be found crouching before “the Man of Sin.” (Cheers.) I care not about the shaking of the mane ; but I feel that if the British lion crouch at all, as crouch he must, it should be at the feet of the Lion of the tribe of Judah ! (Cheers.) I am quite convinced, that if representatives were here from all the churches throughout the length and breadth of Wales, they would fully respond to that sentiment.

Mr. SAMUEL M. GILES, from Altringham, North Cheshire.—The time of the Conference is so extremely valuable, that I will simply state the result of our interviews with the Members for North Cheshire, one of whom (Mr. Tollemache) I have now the honour of seeing on the platform. (Cheers.) Out of four County Members, there is but one Gentleman who has voted against us on the Second Reading of the Bill. We are deputed by the united Dissenters, Wesleyans, and others, to see Mr. Legh, to express to him their sentiments with reference to his conduct ; and to tell him, that such a deep and intense feeling prevails in that district, that no Member will be returned again for North Cheshire, who gives his assent to the Third Reading of the Bill. The deputation expressed their regret to Mr. Cornwall Legh, that he had voted for the Second Reading of a Bill, to which his constituents were conscientiously opposed. The deputation have great satisfaction in stating that, although they have not seen Sir G. Egerton, he is decidedly with us on this question. The Baptists of Manchester are, as one man, opposed to this insulting and unconstitutional measure.

Rev. T. WOLMAN, from Portsmouth.—I have the honour to represent the Wesleyan Methodists of Portsmouth ; and I have to state, that the Wesleyan Methodists are there, as I believe they are everywhere else, unanimously opposed to this measure. They are Protestants, and they protest against the Endowment of Popery. I waited upon our Members, in company with the Baptist Minister, who is not here to-day, on Tuesday and Wednesday last. The Members are Sir George Staunton and the Hon. Mr. Baring. The result of those interviews was, I am sorry to say, unfavourable. I will mention one or two points with reference to them. We submitted to the Honourable Gentlemen, that, if no other course were available, they might, in reference to this Grant, imitate the conduct of Sir James Graham, who, when

he found popular feeling so entirely against the Educational clauses of the Factory Bill, withdrew them altogether. They might withdraw themselves from the Division. They told us, that, in that case, they would be compromising their own consciences; because they believed it to be a good Bill. The argument which they made use of, in connexion with this, was one which has already been referred to by another Deputy. It was said, "Here we have the great fact, that Ireland is a Catholic Country." We replied, that it was another great fact, that England was a Protestant Country, and had a Protestant Constitution; and that we would set our fact against theirs. We told them, that they had no chance of being returned in future, if they supported this Bill; and they plainly said, that they would rather accept the Chiltern Hundreds than violate their consciences. With regard to one of these interviews, I may remark, that we were told, that a certain Member of the House of Commons—you will excuse my mentioning the name—who knew that every one of his constituents was opposed to this Grant, and had received a letter from every one to that effect, applied to the Speaker of the House of Commons, to ascertain, whether, in such a case, it would not be right for a Member of the House of Commons to accept the Chiltern Hundreds. The Speaker's reply was, "No; when you come to this House, you are no longer the Representative of the Borough which sent you; but are to do your utmost for the welfare of the British Empire."

The Rev. HENRY LAWSON, from North Shields.—I have been sent to this Conference by all denominations in the Town in which I reside,—by the Church people, by the Methodists, by the Baptists, by the Independents, and by the Presbyterians; and nowhere is there a stronger feeling against this measure than in South Shields. In that Town there are fifteen or sixteen Congregations, and nearly all have joined in petitioning. We have had two Meetings. At the first there was a little opposition, arising from what is called the extreme Voluntary Party. A very large Meeting was afterwards held, in the Wesleyan Methodist Chapel, at which perhaps fifteen or sixteen hundred people were present; at the other Meeting there were eight or nine hundred. There was, I believe, a Petition sent from South Shields, in favour of the measure; but when I tell you, that, out of a population of thirty thousand persons, this Petition received only twenty-two signatures, I think you will see, that not much value is to be attached to it. The people there resolved to contend against the measure, to the utmost limits of propriety and loyalty.

J. MATHER, Esq., also of South Shields.—I had, previously to my coming here, written to our Member, Mr. Warren. His reply was, "I feel regret, that any vote of mine should give offence to the constituency. I was elected on Liberal principles, professing myself in favour of Religious Toleration; and now, when I exercise the right conferred upon me, the confidence of the constituency seems shaken." However, he concludes this note by saying, "If the course I have marked out be not in harmony with the feelings of my constituents, I shall feel it my duty not to give my vote in the future stages of the Bill." We saw Mr. Warren; and a Deputation of five or six, Clergymen and others, pressed upon him again, the necessity of reconsidering his vote. He said, that, knowing the determination of the Town, he would

not go to the House again, but would leave the measure to take its own course; and he further had the manliness to say, that, if we were not satisfied with that course, he would, if required, resign his seat. I may remark, that the Marquis of Londonderry stated the other day, that there was no public feeling in that County upon this subject. We are here as a deputation to controvert that opinion. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. SAMUEL DUNN, from Halifax.—I had a very lengthy conference this morning with Mr. Charles Wood, the Member for Halifax. We went over most of the points involved in the present measure. He stated, however, that having, while in the Ministry, voted for the ordinary Grant to Maynooth, consistency would oblige him, though he had not voted for the First or Second Readings, on account of being in the Country, to vote for the Grant to Maynooth as an Educational measure. He says, he felt bound to vote for the Third Reading. He expressed, in very strong terms, his opposition to Popery. He also stated an important fact. He said, that, whilst he was in the Admiralty, during an agitation in Ireland, he sent a gentleman to the Western Counties, whilst the agitation existed, to attend to the victualling of the soldiers in that part of Ireland. This gentleman had a good deal to do with the Priests in that part of the Country; and he told him, that he invariably found, that the young gentlemen who had been educated at Maynooth were exceedingly narrow-minded and bigoted. (Hear, hear.) I have also seen Mr. Protheroe, and have had a conversation with him; and he engages to give the Bill, in every stage, his most determined opposition.

Sir W. C. SETON, from Aberdeen.—We have waited upon Mr. Bannerman, at Brookes's Club. We had a rather long conversation with that Gentleman; but I will not do more than state the result of the interview. He received the Deputation in the most frank manner; and I think that, upon the whole, the Deputation left him under the impression, that the interview was a satisfactory one. The position in which that Gentleman stands is, that he has not voted on the question at all, except on Mr. Ward's Amendment. He stated, that he had, when the Bill was first brought in, intended to take that course (of not voting) all along; but, while he did not wish to pledge himself,—not knowing what circumstances might occur between this and the 19th of May,—seeing the strong feeling which his friends in Aberdeen evinced on the subject, he felt very strongly inclined to vote against it on the Third Reading. He authorised me to make this public; but distinctly declined to pledge himself.

The Rev. DAVID STEWART, from Stirling.—I appear here as the Deputy, I am sorry to say, the only Deputy, from the royal and ancient Borough of Stirling. I had the happiness to be appointed to attend the Conference along with the Rev. Alex. Bean, well known as one of the most popular advocates of the Free Church of Scotland. I beg to state, that I received a letter last night from that Gentleman, relating the circumstances which have occurred to prevent him from being present; but his heart and his soul are with us. In consequence of his absence, it falls upon me to represent—I am afraid I shall do it but feebly,—not only my own Congregation—the United Secession Congregation in the Town, and the Secession interests,—but I may say the interests of the Free Church in that Town and the locality. You may rest



assured, Sir, it was no slight feeling that made us, on the spur of the moment, leave our homes, our families, and our Congregations, to travel from the foot of the Grampian Mountains, a distance of four or five hundred miles, to give our opposition to this Bill. (Hear, hear.) As to the opinion and feelings, which prevail generally—I may say universally—in that Borough and District, respecting this Bill, it is one of decided and determined opposition. They regard the measure as a very bad one :—one unjust in principle, unwise in policy, and pregnant with danger to the interests of the Protestant Church. At a Public Meeting, called by the Chief Magistrate before I came away, a Petition was agreed to, expressive of the opinion of those who were present on this subject ; and that Petition I have now in my pocket. There has been more petitioning in reference to this question within a very short period, than there has been for many years previously on all other subjects. In obedience to your suggestion, Sir, I waited upon our Member yesterday afternoon ; and of that Member, I wish to speak in terms of the greatest possible respect. (Hear, hear.) It is Lord Dalmeny, who represents that Borough and District. My opinion is, that he is an excellent Nobleman, but that he has now taken a wrong step ; the only wrong one, I believe, he has ever taken, in the opinion of his constituency, in his parliamentary capacity. He referred to the “ Chronicle ” for the reasons which had induced him to vote in favour of the measure, and which still seemed to influence him. He has no hope of being returned again. (Hear, hear.) I am glad to have this opportunity of simply stating these facts.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—Gentlemen have requested, that if any business remains to be transacted, they may be informed of it as soon as possible. There are two points which we consider it still needful to dispose of. One affects immediate action on your return to your friends.

It was then moved by the Rev. H. PEAKE of Abergavenny ; seconded by the Rev. T. WIGNER :

“ That it is most important, that renewed, and (where equally efficient) *united* Meetings should be held, on the return of the Deputies to their several localities.”

The Resolution was carried unanimously.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—It is thought extremely desirable, that we should have a day set apart for humiliation and prayer in reference to this subject ; I should be very sorry if the Conference were to separate, without our making some arrangement of that kind. The matter must be left very much to the convenience and option of our friends when they return home, but it would be a delightful thing, if there should be some one day appointed, on which some of us may feel that we are, at the very same time, and under the very same circumstances, pouring out our feelings and our desires before the throne of Heaven. It is therefore proposed, to adopt a Resolution on that subject, which will now be submitted to you.

“ That it is exceedingly desirable that we should acknowledge the hand of God by special prayer and humiliation, under present circumstances, and that be the day appointed for that purpose.”

We are quite sensible that many might choose another time ; but still, if we can generally look to some one time, it will be a satisfactory circumstance. It is thought desirable that either Sunday the 11th, or Sunday the 18th, (the day before that appointed for the Third Reading,) should fill up the blank in the Resolution. (Several voices, "The 18th.")

The Rev. R. MOORE, Rural Dean of Rugby, proposed, and the Rev. W. VEVERS, Wesleyan Minister, of Derby, seconded the Resolution.

The Resolution having been supported by the Rev. Dr. REED, the Rev. J. T. ROBINSON, Rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn, said—I only wish to make one remark, with reference to the proposal for setting apart a day for general humiliation and prayer to Almighty God, as connected with our present object. While I heartily concur in the spirit which has dictated that Resolution, I wish it to be understood, that I must not be considered as being implicated, (and I believe some of my Reverend friends here are in the same position as myself) in a Resolution for setting apart any particular day for that purpose—which I have no authority to do, under the constitution of the Church to which I belong.

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—It appears to me, that we ought to honour the feelings to which Mr. Robinson has given expression. Every case would be met, if, in addition to the Resolution, which has just been read, some recommendation of this sort were agreed to :—That the Conference hope that those, to whom it may not be convenient to fix any particular day, will, at their own convenience, have reference to the same object.

The Resolution was postponed, in order that it might be amended.

The Rev. T. WIGNER, Baptist Minister, from Lynn.—I am part of a Deputation from Lynn, composed of Wesleyans and various Dissenting bodies. The feeling there is strongly against this Bill. The movement originated amongst the Clergy ; and, although that movement has not been hostile to ours, still it has been thought better for us to act in our separate capacities. We have waited upon the two Members for our Borough. Lord Jocelyn received us courteously ; but he held out to us no hope whatever of a change taking place in his opinions. We gave him distinctly to understand, that Resolutions had been adopted at Public Meetings, expressive of a disapproval of his conduct ; and that it was not likely, that, at another Election, he would receive the support of the Wesleyan Methodists, or be returned for the town of Lynn. He still protested, that he must support the Bill on three grounds. First, that of compact ; secondly, because it was an Educational Grant ; and thirdly, because it was an experiment. (Laughter.) We endeavoured to combat these three views, but with very little success. He told us, that a Petition had been sent from Lynn, in favour of the Grant. We inquired, from whom did that Petition emanate ? and he informed us, that it came from Mr. Langford, the Unitarian minister, and was signed by thirty persons. We propose on our return to hold a Meeting to report concerning the transactions of this Conference.

The Rev. R. HAMILTON, of Lynn.—I beg to state the result of a conversation with Lord George Bentinck. He stated, that his object was to have two Establishments in Ireland ; and that he would risk the consequences. I wish I could indulge the hope, which some gentlemen have indulged, that

we shall send both our Members adrift. I cannot, however, indulge that hope. Although they are both voting against the wish of their constituents, I have no doubt they will be returned again.

The Resolution, with reference to the appointment of a day for humiliation, was again brought forward in an amended form; and it was moved by the Rev. R. MOORE, Rural Dean of Rugby; seconded by Rev. W. VEVERS, Wesleyan Minister, of Derby; supported by Rev. Dr. REED, Congregationalist, and Rev. JABEZ BURNS, Baptist Minister:

“That, under our present circumstances, is exceeding desirable, that we should acknowledge the hand of God by special prayer and humiliation; and that Sunday, the 18th, be regarded as the period when we may have the happy consciousness of uniting in the same act of worship at the same time; and that, where this day is not convenient, the object may still be borne in mind.”

The Resolution was put to the Conference, by the Chairman, and adopted unanimously.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—I beg to state that upon the 23rd of April, a week ago, when the last return to the House was made, there had been presented 7,240 petitions, with 918,726 signatures. We may fairly calculate, that the number of petitions at the present time exceeds 7,500; and, as to the signatures, we have certainly reason for believing, that they amount to upwards of a million.\* (Cheers.)

The Rev. CHARLES PREST.—One thousand Petitions have been presented, up to this time, to the House of Lords, from the Wesleyans. I am in a position to astonish that House, on any night that I may please to do so.

The Rev. B. ELLIS, a Clergyman of the Established Church, from North Staffordshire.—I only wish to state, that I have seen and heard enough to-day, with regard to three Members,—one representing our Borough, and two our County,—to show, that, when we go back, we must work harder than ever, in order to prove to them, that neither Tractarians nor Infidels shall represent us. (Hear, hear.)

J. VENABLES, Esq., from the same County.—I do not know whether I need do more than confirm what the Reverend Mr. Ellis has stated. We came up with a very determined, and (I think) Constitutional purpose, both as regards our great Constitution and the Laws of our Country. We came up with the Signatures of 650 freeholders of the Northern Division of the County of Stafford, who have resolved never to support a man who does not oppose this Bill. We brought likewise from the Town of Burslem and the vicinity, the Signatures of 350 Electors of the Borough of Stoke-upon-Trent, which we presented to Mr. Ricardo. These Electors have resolved, that they will never support a man again, who does not oppose this Grant to Maynooth. We have not been successful in gaining the County Members; but we have ascertained now a more alarming ground of opposition, than that which we had

---

\* The whole number of Petitions and Signatures greatly exceeded this amount.—  
EDITOR.

when we came up to London. Mr. Jesse David Watts Russell, in our conversation with him, said, it must be understood by us, that England had for three hundred years been inflicting upon Ireland wrongs, and that it is a question which must be taken into consideration, whether these wrongs cannot be redressed by measures far more extensive than the Endowment of Maynooth? (Hear, hear.) I go down with new determination to oppose Popery, in the way that I am called to oppose it, in the way that the Fathers of our Protestant Religion opposed it. We must throw away all our minor differences, (hear, hear,) and meet the enemy in broad day-light, on broad principles. I trust that, from this moment, we shall not be agitated by any questions, but such as bear directly upon the Protestant Principles. Sir Culling, you are our Premier. (Laughter.) Under God, you are called to act a most important part. (Hear, hear.) It is asked, What are we to do if Sir Robert Peel is removed? I leave this to God. The mantle may fall on Elisha. What we have to do is—to defend our great Protestant Principles. The Government is in error; for the great Principles of Protestant Truth we will live; and, if God call upon us to do so, for those Principles we will die. (Cheers.)

J. TROTTER, Esq., from St. Albans, took the Chair for a few minutes, in the absence of Sir Culling Eardley Smith, whose presence was required in the Committee.

The Rev. Dr. REED.—A Deputation of Gentlemen, who have, seen the leading Free Trade Members, will now be called upon to address the Conference.

The Rev. Dr. MASSIE.—It was intended, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, that a brief statement should be given yesterday of the result of our interview with those Gentlemen; and it was rather desirable, that the report should be given in connexion with the appearance of our most estimable and truly devoted friend, the Honourable and Reverend H. M. Villiers, who was present to advocate our cause. His brother is a man of equal devotedness to the object which he has taken up, and who has, with equal consistency, pursued that object. He is, in fact, regarded by the Free Traders as their great Champion in the House of Commons. He is therefore connected, not only with the Borough which he has hitherto represented, but with the whole of that Party throughout the Country. I was rather sorry to hear yesterday, that the Deputies from Wolverhampton had not seen him; I hope they have seen him by this time. (A voice, "Yes.") I am perfectly satisfied he is in a fit state of mind for them to deal with. (Laughter.) I believe, that he and his friends feel themselves to be completely in a mess. (Laughter.) They would give a good deal, for the sake of the success of their cause, if this Bill were at Botany Bay. Now what I want to be done in reference to our friends is, to induce every person who has the slightest influence or interest in the question of Free Trade, to ply them with arguments of truth and honour, in order that they may feel still more uncomfortable. The question has been put by them, "But what are you to do for Ireland? If you withdraw this Bill you will have disturbance all over the Country—how then are you to govern Ireland?" The reply made was: "Do that which is right in England; and leave the consequence, in reference to Ireland, or any other

part of the World, with God. (Cheers.) You ought not, in order to pacify Ireland, to do that which would be an act of injustice towards Ireland and England itself." The feeling of our friends is, that they would like to exercise liberality towards the people of Ireland. They said, "How is it that you make this opposition to the Grant to Maynooth, when you have never before lifted up your voice against other Endowments in Ireland? You are opposing Popery rather than a principle." We said, "Our object was to prevent the carrying of this Measure, because it was the recognition of a bad principle; and we were not at all involved in the consequences of what might be considered as inconsistency in reference to others; our object was, to secure their consistency." I think if our friends throughout the Country, who are Free Traders, will communicate with their Members, they will gain an accession of strength from them. Our friend Mr. Cobden said, "Well, I am going down to Lancashire; and I suppose I must learn my Catechism." I said, "You must." Now I would make them go through their Catechism, in every part of the Country.

Rev. J. GEDEN, from Wolverhampton.—I went with the other members of the Deputation this morning, to wait on the Honourable Mr. Villiers. We had an interview with him, and were treated with great courtesy. At first he appeared to wish to maintain, that there was to be no Endowment at all; but we were not inclined to admit *that*. We told him, that we considered the present Bill to involve the principle of Endowment: and when the principle was once admitted, it was impossible to say how far it might be carried. We had a conversation of some length with him. He said, during its progress, that he had been perplexed by this question; he would give it his most mature consideration: but he could not promise not to vote for the Third Reading, nor could he promise to absent himself. He said, he thought this House of Parliament had gone too far to retrace its steps. I told the Honourable Gentleman, he might be as sure as that we were there standing, that, if this House passed the Third Reading, addresses would be presented to Her Majesty imploring Her to summon another House. We said, "Perhaps that would be a very different House from this."

The Rev. ALEXANDER STRACHAN, from Lincoln.—I waited upon Lord Worsley this morning. His Lordship received me with great kindness: but he gave me distinctly to understand, that, if he thereby risked the loss of his seat, he would vote for the Third Reading of the Bill.

The Rev. J. STEPHENSON, from Grimsby.—Lord Worsley appears quite prepared to forfeit his seat. He thinks he is bound by the views which he entertains, in such a manner, that he cannot find any way of averting such consequences as he sees before him. I beg leave to say, in reference to Grimsby, that there is there a strong feeling upon this question. Petitions to the House of Commons have been signed most readily, and have been sent up by the earliest post. Our friends there will be prepared for whatever course it may be thought desirable to pursue.

The Rev. THOMAS HARRISON, Wesleyan Minister, from Macclesfield.—I have to report the very cordial and unanimous sentiment which prevails in the town of Macclesfield on this question. Although the Clergy do not unite with us, the principal Minister of Macclesfield told me, that they had sent up

a Petition, with the Signatures of Thirty-five Clergymen against this measure. I am happy to state, that the Wesleyans, chiefly by very early interviews with both their Members, succeeded in making those impressions upon their minds, which induced them to vote rightly; and they told me yesterday morning, that they should continue to oppose the Bill in all its future stages.

Mr. BROCKLEHURST, of Grimsditch.—When I left Macclesfield, our friends told me, that they not only felt deeply on the subject, but would subscribe £10 in furtherance of the object; and, if more was wanted, they would be prepared to give a further sum. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. W. BIGGS, from Bedford.—I am an extensive farmer living in the neighbourhood of Bedford. I have listened with feelings of satisfaction to the statements which have been made in this great Conference. From the first moment of its being opened, I have been very anxious, that this great Meeting should be in possession of the peculiarly satisfactory position in which we stand with reference to this matter. I myself am a member of the Wesleyan Society; and I stand in a somewhat different position from most members of that body. I have not relinquished my membership in the Church of England. It is therefore with peculiar satisfaction, situated as I am, that I have witnessed the feeling expressed by gentlemen of all parties, and especially by Clergymen of the Church of England, who have appeared in this Conference. It has been gratifying to me to hear Dissenters, of every grade and shade of Voluntaryism, expressing their sentiments in the manner they have done. I hope such a state of things will prevail more and more; and then I think Sir Robert Peel will regret bringing forward this measure. I have been a politician ever since I can remember anything at all about politics. I have been a Conservative all my days; and, if any body had told me seven years ago, that I, who have a vote for Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, should come here to hold up my hand against Sir Robert Peel,—the greatest Statesman of this or any other Country, in my view,—I should have said, it was impossible. I belong to the rural districts; and I am considerably interested in Agriculture. I have stood up in a wagon for two hours, to oppose Cobden. Sir Robert Peel's going over to Free Trade rather lessened him in my esteem; but, remembering that he stands at the head of affairs, and has to manage for others as well as for me, I could pocket that affront. He taxed my income, and I was willing to bear that also: but when he comes to me, and wants my money to pay for the Religion of the Papists, he at once rouses my Protestant feelings. (Hear, hear.) Yesterday, on account of the feelings for the first time expressed in this Conference, was one of the proudest days in my existence. I go down to the Country, satisfied that all parties are disposed to merge all their religious differences, in order to unite on this question. I was deputed to write a letter to our Members. Mr. Astell did not vote against the measure in the first instance, but he did vote against it in the second instance; he has told me, that, in deference to our feelings, he will continue to do so. Lord Alford, who replied to me in the most kind manner imaginable, said, that, although he voted for the measure on the First Reading, yet, in deference to the principles which I had laid before him, he would withhold his vote in favour of the Bill, unless there was a call of the House. There was a clause, however, added to that letter, stating, that he

would not vote for it under any circumstances. There are four Conservative Representatives for the County, and I am happy to say that all are Anti-Maynooth men.

The Rev. B. FIRTH.—I come from Burnley, in connexion with the Rev. James Barnsley, of the Church of England, together with whom I represent the different religious communities in that Town. At a very large Meeting of these bodies, we were deputed to this Conference, to represent the feelings of a very large portion of the constituency. We were also deputed to call upon our County Members, Mr. Wilson Patten, and Mr. Talbot Clifton. We have seen both those gentlemen, but they are, I am sorry to say, committed to voting for the Third Reading of this Bill. It is not necessary that I should go over the arguments which were brought forward; but I will merely inform you, that they say they are prepared to sacrifice their seats, rather than involve themselves in the inconsistency of either voting against the Bill, or of not voting at all. The inhabitants of the town of Burnley are, almost to a man, opposed to this measure. There are a few exceptions in the Town; but there is not a solitary one amongst the Wesleyan Methodists, or the Independents. The great mass of the people are decidedly opposed to it.

The Rev. E. PIZEY, of the Established Church of England.—I have ventured to rise for the purpose of addressing the Conference for a few moments, —although I have nothing to state with regard to any particular part of the Country. I merely speak to the general question of the importance of your using your influence effectually; and bringing that influence to bear, as much as possible, on all the Representatives of the United Kingdom. Some of you are aware, that I have felt considerable interest in this great question, which has brought us together from all parts of the Country; and that, in consequence of the deep concern which I felt in reference to it, it was suggested in one of our Meetings, that I should go to Oxford, with a view of using whatever influence I have there, in order to promote our object. When I was at Oxford, waiting the arrival of a friend, whom I see on the platform,—not wishing to lose time, I sat down at the Angel, and addressed a letter to the Editor of the Oxford Journal. Not having had any previous opportunity of ascertaining, how the Editor had treated my communication, I went this morning to Peel's (laughter)—do not be alarmed, Gentlemen—not the residence of the Prime Minister, but Peel's Coffee House (laughter)—in order to see, whether or not that letter had been inserted; and I found, that it had been inserted on Saturday, April 12th,—the Saturday after my arrival. I signed myself "*Clericus Londinensis*." That letter has reference to the question in this way. I lived for some years—nearly twenty, I believe—at Norwood; and, when Captain Alsager was returned for the Eastern Division of Surrey, I was entitled to a vote under the Reform Bill. On that occasion, I went home, and was regretting, with a friend in the neighbourhood, that there was no person to contest that part of the County. Sir Robert Peel has made me a political parson. (Cries of "No, no.") He has made me, at all events, more political than I was before. I confess that I have had but little time during my life, to take any deep interest in politics; I have been so constantly occupied in the education of youth, that I certainly have had no time to enter into the subject, although my inclination might have led me to do so.

But, as I before intimated, I became entitled to a vote for the County of Surrey, for the first time, under the Reform Bill. I was regretting, that there was not likely to be any Conservative Member returned for that Division of the County. I went home desponding; and I found Capt. Alsager's announcement of his views posted on my gate. I went in to dinner, delighted at what I had seen, and at the prospect which it opened; and I determined immediately to give him my warm support. I went to Camberwell that evening, and enrolled my name as one of his supporters. Everybody thought that the attempt would be a perfect failure; that Croydon being the very sink of Radicalism, it was impossible to return a Conservative Member for that Division of the County. But our united exertions in that part of the County so completely prospered, that not only did we return that Gentleman at the head of the poll, but with an immense majority in his favour. I merely mention this, as bearing on the general question of the importance of bringing all your influence to bear, in different parts of the Country. (Hear, hear.) I am merely giving you, as a Member of the Committee, a hint as to the importance of your exerting yourselves; because I am sure, that much may be done in reference to this subject, if Gentlemen will only put forth their energies.

The Rev. ISAAC WATTS, Baptist Minister, from Falmouth.—I very much regret that not more of my brethren are present. I came up, in connexion with my respected colleague, to represent the town of Falmouth. Both the Dissenting and the Wesleyan Bodies petitioned against the Second Reading of the Bill. I myself prepared a Petition, uninfluenced by any communication from the Metropolis. Shortly afterwards, a Petition was sent up from our body, praying that there might be some postponement of the Bill; and, when that had been done, we committed the matter into the hands of Him by whom kings rule, and princes decree justice. (Hear, hear.) The Central Anti-Maynooth Committee, however, sent down a Deputation to Falmouth, and throughout Cornwall, to stir up those who were not already actively engaged in opposing the Bill. That gentleman advised, that we should go on with our opposition; and encouraged us to hope, that the exertions which were being made would ultimately be successful. In accordance with his advice, a requisition was sent to the Mayor, requesting him to call a Public Meeting on this subject. On Monday Evening, a Public Meeting was held, which was very numerously attended; and a Resolution was passed, to the effect, that the measure now before Parliament is unjust in principle, and that, upon that ground, all of us, whether Churchmen or Dissenters, should oppose it. My friend and myself were appointed to come here as a Deputation. Our instructions were, to assure the Committee, that the Meeting would co-operate with them in any peaceable and constitutional methods of opposing the Bill. We were also requested to call on our respected Representatives, Captain Plumridge and the Honourable John Vivian. At that Meeting, it was also agreed, that a Petition against the Third Reading of the Bill should be adopted, and signed immediately; and that was done. On arriving here, in accordance with the advice given by this Conference, we waited (yesterday) upon Captain Plumridge. I wrote a note in the morning, which I sent by a special messenger, requesting that he would appoint an hour for us to see him. During the progress of the Measure, we



had written to him twice or thrice ; he having voted for the First Reading of the Bill. I remonstrated with Captain Plumridge on the subject yesterday morning. He said he had voted for the First Reading of the Bill, with the less hesitation, as the principle had been previously acknowledged by the annual vote of nine thousand pounds, which he had always supported, without a single objection being offered on the part of any one of his constituents. The Captain assured us, however, that, in the event of his being persuaded that a majority of his constituents were opposed to the measure, it should never have his support ; (hear, hear,) nor should any measure ever obtain his support, if he found that a majority of his constituents were opposed to that measure. I think we shall be able to convince him, that a majority of his constituents are opposed to it. Here is our Petition, signed by the inhabitants of Falmouth, belonging to all denominations. If we fail in convincing the Captain, that a majority of his constituents are against the Measure, I can assure the Meeting, that it will not be for want of the signatures of Baptists, Wesleyans, and Independents. If we fail at all, it will be for want of the co-operation of our friends in the Establishment. (Hear, hear.)

Col. CRAWFORD, from Bath.—The Deputies from the Independent and Wesleyan bodies in the City of Bath waited upon the Members for that City, yesterday forenoon. When I mention the names of Lord Duncan and Mr. Roebuck, you will not suppose that we anticipated a favourable result. (Laughter.) They are both decidedly in favour of the measure, and expressed their determination to support it. I need not go into the arguments by which they defended their views, or our replies to them. There is, however, a remarkable inconsistency between the views of these Gentlemen, and the views and opinions of those whom they represent in Bath. The feeling there is very deep, very intense, and I trust will be very permanent, on the subject of opposing this Bill. I am an advocate for consistency, Sir, on all occasions ; and I do not like to see this inconsistency between our Members and the body whom they represent. Although we were received with all courtesy, and with the most kindly feeling, by these Gentlemen,—yet I must say, for one, that the sooner this inconsistency is removed the better ; and if any one ever suggest any plan for removing it, I shall be the first to hail it.

The Rev. G. B. KIDD, of Scarborough.—I represent the North Riding Association of Independent Ministers and Congregations. Mr. Duncombe, one of our Members, has voted against the Bill in all its stages hitherto. The other Member is ill at home, ten miles from Scarborough ; and so he can do nothing in this matter. As he is, I am sorry to say, *for* the Bill, we should hardly wish his illness to be very soon removed. (Laughter.) I hold in my hand a letter from the returning officer of Whitby. He says, “ Our Member is firmly opposed to the Government measure ; so is Mr. Duncombe, Member for the North Riding.” So much for the North Riding of Yorkshire.

The CHAIRMAN.—Respecting Scarborough, Mr. Walsh, the Wesleyan Superintendent, will probably give us some statements.

The Rev. J. WALSH.—I am very happy to tell you, Sir, that a very large portion of the inhabitants of Scarborough are with you, in all the principles, and in all stages of your proceedings. I am happy to say also, that we have nearly succeeded in bringing one of the Members for the Borough to

think with us,—I refer to Sir John Johnstone. The Rev. Mr. Kidd and myself had a long interview with both the Members yesterday. Sir Frederick Trench received us with the greatest kindness. We found that a communication which we had forwarded to him, signed by a large number of the constituents, had put him in a great ferment. He was then preparing a document of great importance, as he is connected with the Government, making some propositions with respect to Ireland, which proves that he is anxious to do something :—I think he will continue to vote with the Government. But Sir John Johnstone did (in consequence of the letter which we sent to him, containing extracts) abstain from voting altogether, the last time the subject was under discussion in the House of Commons ; and I believe he is now in such a state of mind (I intend to see him again before I leave Town) that he will either vote against the Measure, or not vote at all. There was one point of great importance, which he wished to understand, in reference to the teaching at Maynooth ; and if that could be made out, he said he would vote against the Measure. I am happy to tell you, that all the Clergymen of the Establishment in Scarborough have petitioned against the Measure. I believe every Minister, of every Denomination, is opposed to it ; and both the Members know, that, if they support this Measure, they will be unsupported at the next Election. (Laughter.)

A DEPUTY.—I think that, if Sir Robert Peel perseveres, Sir John Johnstone will not persevere with him ; but that he will try to get the Bill slipped overboard.

The Rev. J. M'GREGOR, of the Relief Church, from Stranraer in Scotland.—Sir, you have hitherto been listening to the reports of gentlemen, who represent large towns and large constituencies ; and I feel considerable difficulty, therefore, in bringing before you the sentiments of a comparatively small constituency. But, if we have no right to make a demand on your time, on account of the number of our constituents, I think we have a right to demand a moment or two on account of their zeal ; and in proof of this, I may state to you, that from a small town, containing a population of not more than four thousand, no fewer than four individuals have been sent up to this Conference. (Hear, hear.) All parties agree on this question. Of the Gentlemen who accompany me, one is a Member of the United Secession Church, another of the Free Church, and the third of the Independent Church. Petitions have gone up from each of our Congregations ; and all parties have combined, to send us to represent the Town and Neighbourhood. We have no hesitation in saying, that the strongest feeling prevails against this Measure. I dare not say, that there are *no* supporters of the Bill ; but I have not met with one, though I have considerable intercourse with the inhabitants. We are opposed to this Measure as unjust, unscriptural, and impolitic ; and we are prepared to give it the most decided and determined opposition. Since we arrived in London, we have received, from different Congregations, commissions to act for them, from Maidenkirk to Dumfriesshire. We have not had an interview with Sir John M'Taggart ; but I received a letter from him, on the morning on which I left, in which he said, “ It is a most iniquitous Measure ; and you may depend upon my offering my opposition, in every stage of the Bill.” We did not think

it necessary, therefore, to call upon him. We did call, however, upon Captain John Dalrymple, Member for the County. He seemed very much struck indeed; and stated that, although he and the Party with whom he acted had expected opposition, and very decided opposition, they had not at all expected the opposition which had been excited. He seemed to doubt his ever being returned again: but I regret to say, that we could not obtain any token from him, either of penitence, or of amendment.

The CHAIRMAN.—It is observable that, in the statements from Scotland, we do not hear of the Clergy of the Established Church attending Meetings. But permit me to say, that it is not their fault. I have reason to know that, in most of the Presbyteries, there is a movement going on. If I might be allowed to say a word with respect to that matter, it would be this, that those who differed on a great question two or three years ago, should not allow that difference to prevent them from cordially co-operating now. (Hear, hear.) I know that, in some instances, the tables have rather been turned; and that there has been a little hesitation on the part of the members of the Free Church, to unite on the same platform with the members of the Established Church.

The Rev. A. S. THELWALL.—Allow me to state, that yesterday I went down with my Reverend friend Dr. Cumming, to attend two Meetings at Aylesbury on behalf of this cause. We naturally fell into conversation on the subject by the way; and he assured me, that there was not a Presbytery in the Church of Scotland which had not petitioned against the Bill.

The Rev. J. M'LEAN, Wesleyan Minister, from Edinburgh.—I wish to be allowed to say, that I greatly rejoiced, Sir, at the remark which you have just made; and I have no doubt that the effect of it will be beneficial in Scotland. As a Wesleyan Minister, I will admit, that my individual sympathies have gone with the Free Church; and the entire of my intercourse has been with its members. At the same time, I am quite sure, that it is our duty, under existing circumstances, to act, as far as we can, upon the very wise and Christian suggestion which has now been made from the Chair. I have reason to think, although I have had no intercourse with the Established Clergy, that, notwithstanding the fervour and zeal of the Free Church party, it will not be impracticable to bring about, on this question, a hearty union of all Protestants in Scotland. I represent the Wesleyan Methodists of Inverness, Aberdeen, Ayr, Perth, Greenock, and Glasgow; and, though I am not very remarkable for selecting the softest terms, I really should hesitate to read extracts from the numerous letters which I have received,—they are all so very strong in opposition to this measure; and on the highest grounds, namely, Religious grounds.

Mr. W. BIGGS, from Bedford.—In the statement which I made to the Meeting, I omitted an important fact. I come as a Deputation, with some other friends here, from the Wesleyans; Mr. Jukes mentioned yesterday, that he came as the representative of the other bodies of Dissenters in Bedford. An important General Meeting of the inhabitants was held in that Town; almost all the inhabitants having signed the Petition. In Bedford there are five parishes. Four of the Clergymen of those five parishes signed, amongst others, and the other was favourable to it; and he told one friend, the other

day, that he was indignant at what had taken place. The Petition sent up was the Petition of the town of Bedford, assembled in the Town Hall, signed by four out of five of the Clergymen. Two young men, however, who are Tutors at a school, got up an adverse Petition, stating it to be the Petition of the Magistrates, Clergy, and inhabitants of Bedford. They sent this Petition up to the House of Commons; and it was presented to the House, in favour of the Maynooth Grant, as coming from the Mayor, the Clergy, and a vast number of the respectable inhabitants of the Town of Bedford. I leave the fact with you.

The Rev. JAMES COOPER, from Bradford, in Yorkshire.—I must be allowed to state, that one of the Members for Bradford, Mr. Hardy, has been so confined by illness recently, as to be unable to attend the House: but so zealous is he in this cause, that, contrary to the advice of his physician, he went down to the House, for the first time this Session, to vote against this Bill. (Cheers.) Our other Member is Mr. William Busfeild. We waited upon him yesterday morning, though we had little hope with respect to him; having already been in correspondence with him. On the First Reading he voted for the Bill; and this led to a great number of letters being sent to him upon the subject, requesting him not to vote again in favour of the Bill. We thought it right to call upon him; but we could get no decided answer from him; although he knows very well that, if he does not give his opposition to this Measure, he cannot possibly be returned again for Bradford. Still he said, without pledging himself as to the future, he would give the matter his most serious consideration; and we have very great hopes, that he will in some degree change the opinions which he has expressed.

The Rev. JACOB STANLEY, Wesleyan Minister, from Weymouth.—I have very little to say, Sir Culling. I am deputed here by the Wesleyan Congregations of Weymouth and the vicinity. They have all petitioned, and they feel very strongly on the question that engages our attention. There have been Petitions likewise, from the other Dissenting Congregations of the Town; and I learn this morning, from a letter which I have received, that there is some little opposition being made to our movements. I waited upon Mr. Bernal yesterday morning. I endeavoured to induce him to abandon the neutral ground which he has occupied from the first; but the attempt was perfectly useless. I told him, as delicately as I knew how, that his neutrality would produce great activity at the next Election. (Laughter). However, he seemed determined to abide by it, and there I left the matter. Allow me to advert for a moment to the island of Portland. There is, it seems, one pro-Maynooth man in that island. He professes to be opposed to the Endowment of Maynooth altogether; only the people there are contracting with the Government for larger quantities of stone; and this individual is sadly afraid, that, if they oppose the Government, the island itself will suffer. (Hear, hear.) I am, however, at perfect liberty to say, that the vast majority of the Electors of the Island of Portland are quite willing that their trade should perish, rather than that they should not oppose this Grant. I received a letter this morning stating as much; and also that, at any future Election, whoever does not vote against this Measure will be most determinedly opposed by the Electors.

The CHAIRMAN.—I should now like to take the sense of the Meeting, as

to whether we should go on or break up. I do not think it desirable, from the appearance of the Conference, that it should sit beyond this evening.

Rev. G. CULLEN, of Leith.—I have come four hundred miles to attend the Conference; and having had some experience in such matters, I must say, that I think the business has been managed most admirably. It is of great importance, that those Deputies who have not communicated facts verbally, should do so by writing. I think it is a most important suggestion, that there should be a permanent organization, to carry out the object of this Conference throughout the Empire, by affiliated Associations. We formed an Association, something of that kind,—without knowing of the existence of the Anti-Maynooth Committee,—in Edinburgh and the neighbourhood. I had the satisfaction of originating a series of lectures, which are now in progress of delivery in Leith; and Mr. Douglas of Edinburgh called together some friends, who formed an Association against Popery. It is of great importance, I think, for this Conference to consider, how far lectures, and the use of the press, may be made to promote our object. I submit this to the Committee of the Conference, as a matter of great practical importance. We are only yet entering the field; we have only heard the signal gun of the great conflict in which we are engaging; and we must be prepared, if this Bill is blown to atoms, for similar measures, and a determination on the part of the Whigs and Tories to attain their object. We must prepare for this, by instructing our people; and that will, I think, be most effectually done, by means of series of lectures, in various localities, and by our taking care, that the press is fully used for our great object.\*

The Rev. W. M'ILWAINE, of Belfast.—I think the suggestions just made are very important. If we do not devise something of that kind, we shall, I fear, go away *re infectâ*. Let me observe, that, although perhaps it may be inconvenient to others as well as myself, to remain in Town, or to come back to Town, I think we might meet for the purpose of carrying out that special object. If a Special Meeting of this Conference were called for next Monday, I for one would attend.

Some conversation then took place, in which the Rev. Dr. Bunting, the Rev. Dr. Brown, the Rev. Mr. M'Ilwaine, the Rev. J. W. Thompson, of Perth; the Rev. W. Moore, of Truro; the Rev. W. Bunting, the Rev. Mr. Robinson, and others took a part,—on the expediency of having another Meeting of the Conference. The reasons, for and against it, having been fully discussed, it was finally proposed, seconded, and carried unanimously, that the Conference, on its rising, should adjourn until twelve o'clock on the following day (Saturday.)

The CHAIRMAN then read the following letter from the Rev. Dr. Chalmers :—

(Copy.)

*"Edinburgh, April 26, 1845.*

"Dear Sir Culling,

"I have not been able to attend any of those demonstrations of Protestant feeling which are now taking place everywhere, both in England and Scotland; but I rejoice in the opportunity you have given me of stating how much I approve of them.

---

\* These suggestions of the Rev. G. Cullen are very important, and ought to be generally acted on.—EDITOR.

"You may well believe, how one who estimates so highly as I do the power of a National Endowment, and who has laboured for years to enlist that power on the side of a Scriptural Church, or of a Church which acknowledges the permanent authority of the Bible as the alone rule of faith and practice,—you may well understand the principle of my regret and alarm, when this power changes sides, and passes from the support of that which is good, to the support or encouragement of that which I regard as diametrically its opposite, and therefore hold to be essentially and most fearfully evil. Did the question turn on any theological nicety, and by which Parliament would be transformed into an arena of subtle and interminable controversies, I could understand how it is, that our Statesmen should refuse to entertain it, and so make the rule of a fleeting and short-lived expediency their all in all. But turning, as it does, on so broad and potent a generality as that—'whether the people of these Realms should be trained in the lessons of that Book which our Rulers still profess, I should imagine, to be the Word of God; or be trained in such other lessons as may have emanated, in former times, from the usurpers of a Divine authority, and which lessons might be still further vitiated and extended at pleasure by the successors of so tremendous an usurpation;'—if Parliament now profess their incompetency to decide upon *that*—regarding which no difficulty was felt, and no indecision manifested, by the Parliaments of other days,—then the inference to my own mind appears unavoidable,—that the Legislature which confesses its own incapacity to pronounce on the grand distinction between Popery and Protestantism, is unworthy of being trusted on any question which relates to that best and highest of all education, the education of principle. It is my earnest hope and prayer, that our Legislature may yet be saved from an exhibition at once so melancholy and so ruinous; and that, by the noble exertions which you are now making, and which you have done so much to direct and to stimulate, there might still be averted the greatest moral calamity which can befall our Nation.

"But should you be defeated in your immediate object, let me hope that the friends of a pure and unadulterated Revelation will still keep together, and do their uttermost to alleviate, and, it may be, with the blessing of God, to neutralize the mischief that shall then have been perpetrated. To counter-work the evils of a State Endowment on the side of error, let popular Endowments be multiplied and extended on the side of Truth. I am aware that the very term of an Endowment is obnoxious to many. But it is not the term that we contend for, if we only had the thing. Our meaning is, that, if money is henceforth to be given from the national Treasury for the support of Popish Colleges and Churches, then let Evangelical Christianity, throughout all her Denominations, henceforth redouble her diligence and liberality, in the support of Colleges and Churches consecrated to science and a sound literature, as well as to the pure Theology of the Bible. Many wonder at the Free Church of Scotland, with her newly-formed seminary of nigh two hundred students, for the supply of Ecclesiastical labourers to between seven and eight hundred Congregations,—all upheld by contributions from the middle and working classes, for, with a few rare exceptions, the Aristocracy are opposed to us. But they would cease to wonder, if they but knew the mighty power of accumulated littles, when made to flow into a central Treasury, throughout the channels of a very simple, provided it be only a well-worked, organization. Let each of the great Protestant Communions, both in Scotland and England, have but such a Treasury, and such an organization; and, call this an Endowment or not, it will be, at least an *instrumentality* by which possession might be taken of the great bulk and body of the people; and the National power, now put forth in the support of a degrading superstition, be effectually coun-

teracted, by the National will now aroused, and shortly, I trust, to be put forth, in the like support of a Scriptural and enlightened faith.

"You ask me, if I think that the friends of Protestantism are now on a right course of action, or if there be aught amiss in their proceedings? My only regret is, that their differences on the Voluntary question should be suffered to operate with a distracting force, or in the least to relax their cordial and vigorous co-operation against the Endowment of Popery. My own views on the desirableness, and the duty of a Christian Government, to provide the institutes of a right Christian education, have long supplied me with an *argumentum à fortiori* against the Maynooth Endowment, which, from the very first, I have regarded as wrong in principle and pernicious in operation. It seems to me strange, that men will not act together, in the support of every cause which they deem to be righteous, and on which they think together. 'Nevertheless, whereto we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing.'\* The matter on hand is, to put down, or if not, to lift our united protest against, what we all agree in holding to be a most portentous evil. Nor do I see either the necessity or the wisdom, because of certain differences on other subjects,—and which, in present circumstances too, are wholly of an abstract and theoretical description,—that we should, therefore, on this subject of pressing and practical, and altogether paramount importance, fall out among ourselves. I am not aware, however, of this having taken place to any extent in London, as in some instances throughout the provinces. Let me hope better things of your great movement; and that, as the effect of it, the men of all Communions, who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, will come to know each other; and will join, heart and hand, in promoting that sacred cause of *Union* among Protestants, which you, Sir, have so long and ably advocated; and the want of which has operated so grievously, both to the reproach and the hinderance of our common faith.

"I have the honour to be,

"My dear Sir Culling,

"Yours with great esteem and regard,

(Signed) "THOMAS CHALMERS.

"Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart."

It was proposed, seconded, and agreed to unanimously, that this letter should be published with the proceedings of the Conference.

The Conference then adjourned until twelve o'clock on the following day.

---

\* Phil. iii. 16.

## Fifth and Last Sitting,

SATURDAY MORNING, MAY 3, 1845.

---

THE Conference resumed its session at twelve o'clock.

The Rev. JAMES KELLY, Rector of Killeshee, Ireland, offered up prayer on behalf of the Meeting.

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, as the Meeting this morning must necessarily be short, you will pardon me for impressing on our friends who will to-day address us, even more emphatically than previously, that their communications should be as concise as possible; and I think they should have reference rather to their Members, and the prospect respecting their Members, than to facts relating to the state of feeling in the Country. While speaking of our arrangements for to-day, let me also add, that, upon the breaking up of the Conference, it will be desirable for the Committee to meet for half an hour or an hour, in order to make arrangements for dealing with the subjects committed to them. Several important subjects have been committed to them; for instance, the Address to Ireland—a very important subject,—the subject of Protestant Union, of which it will be desirable to present an outline during the next fortnight,—the publication of the Report, (to which I attach great importance) with a List of all the Deputies present. Without troubling the Conference with these matters, let me say, that it will be necessary for the Committee to meet, to determine when the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee shall proceed to these matters of business. I should anticipate that the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee (to whom you have committed these subjects) will probably deal with them in this manner;—at their first Meeting, they will submit each subject to a Sub-Committee; and, the Sub-Committee having made their reports, the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee will then take them into consideration. Let it therefore be understood, that (after the Conference breaks up) the General Committee will meet in the Committee-room; and, of course, it will be an open Committee, for any other persons who may choose to come.

Gentlemen, there are one or two topics which I feel impelled by my own feelings, and which I am also urged by letters that I have received, to mention to you this morning. I may state, that one refers to the withdrawal of a very small section of our number—(and all who have seen their withdrawal



must bear witness that the number was small)—from the Conference. The other is a matter connected with Lord John Russell. With regard to those gentlemen, who have withdrawn from the Conference, it cannot have escaped your notice, that a portion of the press which is opposed to us, is trying to make the most of it. (Hear, hear.) Our friends have probably seen the articles in the liberal *Morning Chronicle*. That paper endeavours to represent us as undergoing a very serious schism. Gentlemen, you remember the old fable of the ox and the fly. The fly apologised to the ox for his weight; and the ox said, that he had not felt it. (Laughter.) Now our fly—I hope, if this reaches their ears, they will understand, that I have said it good humouredly,—without in any way saying anything against those gentlemen for exercising the discretion which they were entitled to exercise,—our fly, instead of weighing down our back, has flown off; and if the fly in the fable were told, that his weight was not felt, I think we may say—except that we are always sorry, that any individuals should not see it to be their duty to act with us,—except in so far as that, I think we may say, that the weight of our fly is not missed. Gentlemen, I have attended thus to the leading articles of the *Chronicle*. Allow me, for a moment, to refer to some correspondence, which appears in the *Chronicle*, and which has the most remarkable, and, to us, satisfactory effect, of one correspondent answering the other. One of the correspondents of the *Chronicle* states, that this has been a No-Popery Conference; that all our arguments have been in accordance with what is understood by that word “No-Popery;” which means,—which they intend should mean, this—that,—as some of our friends have conscientiously felt, in former times—in which, I may be permitted to say, I disagreed with them)—as some of our friends have felt in former times, that it was right that Roman Catholics should be excluded from Parliament,—and *that* has been connected with the No-Popery cry,—such is our feeling also. The object of calling this a No-Popery Conference is quite evident. The way in which a word is used has often more effect than the grammatical meaning of the word itself; and the object of calling this a No-Popery Conference is evidently, to implicate us in the charge, of refusing to Roman Catholics their Civil Rights. One of these correspondents in the *Chronicle* represents us as a No-Popery Conference in that sense; and says, there are a great many Churchmen, a great many Wesleyans, and two or three Dissenters. (Laughter.) But, in the same column, there is another communication, which says, the Clergy of the Established Church had better look to what is going on—(Laughter)—that *they* will find the great proportion of the persons attending here are Dissenters; that there is Sir Culling Smith, with his Anti-State-Church views, anxious to enforce them. (You will judge, my friends, whether that is true?)—(Hear, hear)—and that it is quite clear, that our Conference is an underhand attempt to subvert all Establishments. Now, in one column of the *Morning Chronicle* is an instance of that, which I hope will take place throughout the Country,—one of our opponents most effectually answering the other! (Cheers.) But, Gentlemen, still keeping to that point—the imputed schism in our body. I beg to read a portion of a letter which I have received on this subject. It is written by an excellent Baptist Minister—the Rev. Samuel Green:—

"Dear Sir Culling,

"In returning to you the enclosed ticket, requesting your Committee to be good enough to take my name out of the list of Delegates, meeting in your present Anti-Maynooth Conference, I beg to say a few words.

"1. There are many reasons, in my opinion very strong ones, why Dissenters should not be mixed up with an exclusively theological (if so I may call it without offence) opposition to the Maynooth Bill before the House of Commons. I need not state those reasons now. To my mind they have always appeared strong enough to require our abstaining from all connexion with the Conference.

"2. From the terms of the promise made to myself, and other gentlemen, who waited on your Committee on Tuesday evening last, I hoped, in common with many of my brethren, that 'freedom of speech' would have been allowed to all Delegates, and that Dissenters would be able, if they joined you, to infuse some additional element to that, which, evidently enough, many gentlemen were anxious to have exclusively pervading the assembly. I fancied we should have found room for, at least, a clear acknowledgment of the civil and religious rights of our long-oppressed Roman Catholic fellow-subjects in Ireland; and perhaps for some expression of our views of the great injustice and wrong, if not of all Endowed Churches, of the Protestant Church of Ireland."

Gentlemen, a Dissenting Minister, invited to a Meeting of Churchmen and Dissenters—convened upon a generous basis of mutual forbearance—expected, that he would be able to express his views as to the injustice of the Established Church of Ireland! (Hear, hear.) Why, Gentlemen, there would be an end of all generosity. (Hear, hear.)

"3. You, Sir Culling, seemed anxious, and indeed repeatedly manifested your anxiety, to secure to my friends and to myself a fair hearing in the sitting of Wednesday evening; but, though with only one exception, as far as I observed, (that of Mr. Prest,) the gentlemen who sat around you on that occasion, and whom I and my friends had met on the preceding evening, did not resist your impartial and promised conduct towards us, it was abundantly evident, that even you, Sir Culling, could not control the Meeting in this matter."

Now, Gentlemen, here are three points; first, what is called the "exclusively theological" character of our effort; secondly, the assertion, that we—having invited Deputies upon one basis—when they came to London, they found themselves dealt with upon another; and, thirdly, that these gentlemen had not a fair hearing on the particular occasion when they left the Conference. Gentlemen, with regard to the first point, that this is a theological movement, I beg to say, that, from the first, this Conference has been convened of those who, differing upon some minor shades of doctrine, differing upon some matters of discipline, and differing in their views as to Establishments, were yet agreed in this one thing, that Protestantism should not allow Popery to be Established. (Cheers.) And I cannot understand, how any gentleman, invited upon that basis—putting aside those other points, and concentrating attention on that one point—the Endowment of Popery,—could expect, that this Conference should take any other course than that of a *Religious* opposition to such a measure. (Hear, hear.) Gentlemen, with regard to the second statement, that this Conference was invited upon one basis, and that gentlemen who came to it found, that they were dealt with

upon a different plan, and were prevented from speaking as they had anticipated that they should be allowed to speak,—without going into the details or the proofs of that (which my friends the Dissenters connected with this Conference, if they know what is due to their own character and position, will, I hope, put before the public in its true light)—(Hear, hear)—without going into those questions of detail, I beg, as my own conviction of past facts, distinctly to assert, that no gentleman has been precluded from saying anything, which he had a right to expect, from the public documents of this Conference, that he would be permitted to say. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, with regard to the remaining point in this gentleman's letter,—namely, that I endeavoured to procure for him and his friends a hearing, which the Meeting, from which they departed, was unwilling to grant them,—I beg to say, that between myself and that Meeting there was a perfect accordance; and I cannot allow myself to be complimented at the expense of those over whom I presided. (Hear, hear.) You did give a patient hearing to those gentlemen, as long as they kept themselves within the prescribed bounds; and it was only upon their departing out of those bounds, that there was a call to order. (Hear, hear.) The Chair was appealed to; I responded to that appeal; and I fully concurred in your opinion, that those gentlemen ought to be prevented from going further in the direction they were taking. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, having thus disposed of that subject, I beg leave to read to you a portion of a letter, referring to another matter.

“The Rev. J. Baldwin Brown (deputy from Derby) presents his compliments to Sir Culling Eardley Smith, and would crave leave, if it be permitted, to make a brief communication through him to the Meeting. Being fully persuaded of the wisdom and necessity of the regulation, that not more than two delegates from the same place should address the Meeting, he abstained from adding anything to the full statement of his co-delegates, the Rev. Messrs. Pike and VEVERS. But, being compelled to leave Town at an earlier hour this morning than that appointed for the Meeting, he feels, that he should not be fairly representing his constituents, the Independent body in Derby, if he did not seek thus to express their sentiments on a matter which has perhaps been rather overlooked at this Conference,—the conduct, with regard to this Bill, of a Noble Lord, who formerly occupied a high position in Her Majesty's Councils—Lord John Russell.

“The Dissenters have never had reason to entertain great expectations with regard to Sir R. Peel; therefore they are not disappointed, though they cordially sympathize with those who are; but they have looked on Lord J. Russell as a Statesman who, if he did not coincide with their views, did yet comprehend and respect them better than any other of the principal Statesmen of the day. The unanimous feeling among the Dissenters of Derby, on this matter, is one of deep and bitter disappointment. Lord J. Russell has cast from him the confidence and hope of those who looked for better things at his hands; with what ulterior views, it is impossible to say; and, in the present anomalous state of the political world, it would be presumptuous to guess: but by the Dissenters he can be trusted no longer; and, whilst the principles and measures of Sir R. Peel have met with the most indignant expression of feeling on the part of this Conference, it would be well, that Lord J. Russell,—having equally betrayed his principles and the expectations he had taught his supporters to cherish—should meet with the same.

“Friday morning, May 2.”

Gentlemen, I think our friend is quite right, in wishing that blame should not be cast exclusively upon Sir Robert Peel. Those who had hitherto trusted Sir Robert Peel have felt—and have thought it their duty to express—disappointment at his conduct. But this gentleman, who addresses me, and I (sympathising with that gentleman in his political views)—may also feel ourselves entitled to say, that Lord John Russell—as a professor of this principle, that the money of A should not be paid to support the Religion of B—I do not say whether that principle is right—but, as having professed that principle in the discussions on Lord Althorp's Church Rate Bill, Lord John Russell, who has expressed himself (in the words I quoted yesterday) in the Debate on the Reform Bill, that, when the people speak strongly, it is the duty of the Government to listen, and to yield to their sentiments—I say, Lord John Russell (with the expressions of sentiment which have been made use of by him) is, for all practical purposes, equally to be regarded as acting contrary to his own former professions with Sir Robert Peel. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, with a Deputation, I waited upon Sir Robert Peel some days ago. I also waited upon Lord John Russell. With Sir Robert Peel, it did not become *me* to speak, as a person of different politics might speak; and therefore I felt my tongue rather tied. With Lord John Russell,—to whom I have been in the habit of looking, as the Leader of the Party with whom I chiefly sympathize, I felt that I had a better right to speak:—(hear, hear)—and I told him plainly, that my opinion was, that, if he persevered in the course which he is now pursuing, not all his former claims and deserts at the hands of the Country—not all the reputation and character of his ancestors of the house of Russell—would save him from being regarded by the Country, as one who had departed from his principles; and that he must be prepared to be regarded in future, by those who had hitherto looked up to him, as a public man who was not to be trusted. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) Gentlemen, I feel that I have already detained you far too long. Let me, therefore, request—with a view to the order of this Meeting—that those gentlemen who feel that they have any important facts to communicate in reference to their Members—which must be the object kept in view in this our last Meeting—will have the goodness to send me a slip of paper stating that fact.

Sir WILLIAM C. SETON, of Aberdeen.—I wish to correct a mistake in the *Morning Chronicle*. It is stated, Sir, in the *Morning Chronicle* of to-day, that “Sir William Seton, of Aberdeen, said he had seen Mr. Bannerman, who would vote against the Third Reading.” That would lead any one to suppose, that he had positively pledged himself to vote against it. What I said was, that Mr. Bannerman had distinctly refused to give a pledge on the subject—not knowing what circumstances might occur between this time and the 19th of May; but that he felt strongly induced to accede to the wishes of so large a number of his constituents who were against the Measure; and that the Deputation—while he refused to give a pledge—left him under the confident hope, that he would vote against the Third Reading. It is only justice to Mr. Bannerman to make this statement. (Hear, hear.)

J. OTTER, Esq., from Stokeham, North Nottinghamshire.—I have felt a little misgiving, after having been present in the strangers' gallery, and

observed the tone of the House of Commons. The tone of that House seemed to be very threatening ; but it is not my habit to yield to desponding views ; and I cast myself upon those encouraging principles which sustain us at the present moment. I thought of the beautiful lines, written by a very timid man—giving us a beautiful idea of Christian heroism—the poet Cowper :—

“ He holds no parley with unmanly fears,  
Where duty calls he confidently steers,  
Faces a thousand dangers at her call,  
And, trusting in his God, surmounts them all.”

(Cheers.) I could not help thinking, too, yesterday morning, of the words of Charles Wesley :—

“ The force of unity divine,  
Nor men, nor devils can oppose ;  
• When Jesus doth our spirits join,  
We trample on our mighty foes,  
And spoil Abaddon of his crown,  
And turn his kingdom upside down.”

It is said that our opponents have all the talents. I am satisfied, that, if they have all the political talents *in the House*, they have not all the talents *in the Country*. (Hear, hear.) As the representative (with another gentleman) of North Nottinghamshire, let me say, that we thought we would proceed at once to the most important part of our business—that of waiting upon our Members. It was pleasing to find that in Grosvenor Square the Deputations frequently crossed each other. (Hear, hear.) We called upon Mr. Holdsworth, one of our County Members, first. He received us in the most friendly manner. He said, the measure was a mere friendly one, and was intended to compose differences ; but, without hesitation or delay, he stated that—though he had voted for the Bill on the First and Second Reading—he intended to abstain from voting on the Third Reading. We then proceeded to call on Mr. Gally Knight. I do not know that I should say, I was happy to find him indisposed ; but, as he was indisposed, and as there seemed to be no hope respecting him, I was consoled for not having an interview, by thinking that, if many Gentlemen like him should have a slight touch of the gout, we shall benefit by it. (Laughter.) We then went to Captain Duncombe, one of the Members for the Borough (of East Retford) ; and, though he had been supposed to be hostile to us, he at once stated, that he would carefully and calmly re-examine and reconsider his position. As he held out to us, however, no flattering expectations, I just reminded him, as I thought this would be one of the strongest arguments, of the opinions of the Duke of Newcastle, who had been his patron when he came to the Borough. (Laughter.) We then moved on to the residence of Mr. Granville Harcourt Vernon, son of the Archbishop of York. (Hear, hear.) His case was somewhat different. He had supported the Bill on the First and Second Readings. He gave us a very good reception. I might almost blush indeed

at what he said to me, because he declared, (after listening to me,) that, if he had heard my speech before voting, he thought he should not have voted as he had done. (Laughter.) He said, he had not heard anything so convincing before; and I think it is just within the bounds of possibility, that he means to propose me as a Member of Parliament. (Laughter.) As a plain country farmer, I pointed out to him, the wide difference between rural society in general, where Protestantism prevails, and rural society where Romanism prevails; and that Gentleman allowed at once, that the difference is very great, both in Ireland and in other countries. (Hear, hear.) Sir, Protestantism has had its brightening, raising, elevating influence upon my own district; and we think, that it is a wholesome thing to cast in, in any quarter. Whoever knows the history of our Protestantism must be well aware, that God has often turned aside what threatened to overwhelm it. The present Conference I regard as a great Protestant love-feast, with the enemy at the gates. Let us be united, and that enemy will be overthrown.

The Rev. J. RABY, from Worksoy.—Mr. Vernon was so exceedingly polite and courteous, that he wanted to evade the drift of our observations. Before we left him, I put this question plainly to him, “What will be your conduct on the Third Reading of the Bill?” He said, “I have gone too far to retreat.”

J. C. SERCOMB, Esq. from Exeter.—I waited upon Mr. Divett, and had a long conversation with him on the subject of the Bill; but I am sorry to say, that I could not move him from his purpose of voting for the Third Reading. Like most others on that side of the question, he took it up as a civil, and not a religious question. I told him, that it was as a religious one alone that we regarded it. He told me, in a rather facetious way, that he had as much confidence in my judgment as in that of any man in the city of Exeter; and that he was quite ready to accept the Chiltern Hundreds next morning, provided I would take his place in the House of Commons. (Laughter.) He said, there was no other alternative. I had hoped to see here my colleague, John Bacon, Esq. I do not know whether he has seen Sir William Follett, the other Member; but, as Sir William’s politics and my own differ very much, (though we are very intimate,) I thought it better to leave him to Mr. Bacon.

The Rev. J. R. CAMPBELL, from Edinburgh.—Our Member, of whom we were formerly apt to be proud, the learned Mr. Macaulay, has been described, with more graphic power than elegance, as “a book in breeches.” (Laughter.) Notwithstanding our preparedness for the various arguments which he might offer, we felt, that it would be a very terrible thing for a man like Mr. Macaulay to come down amongst his constituents, unless they were previously well prepared to meet the objections, which might be urged, with great plausibility and power, by such a man as he is. I would remark, that we should avail ourselves of the impulse and fervour which this Meeting has awakened in our souls, on going back to our fellow-electors, to indoctrinate one another with the principal objections to the course of policy which is being pursued, with a view to bringing them to bear on future electioneering Candidates,—that so we may be prepared to meet them, and not be taken by surprise, through the plausibility with which they may state the difficulties

of the course we are pursuing, or the objections which they may offer. All the Deputies should, I think, return with a determination not to lose a single moment; but to call together Meetings to discuss the matter, and to prepare for a contested Election. (Hear, hear.) I hope we have, in this Conference, felt the benefit of uniting together for this great object. We have felt, that while we are permitted to act together, we can do so on reasonable and proper grounds.

Mr. T. BEET, of Sheffield.—I have the honour, Sir, to be the representative of the Wesleyan Methodists of Sheffield. I have great pleasure in saying, that a Meeting was called some time ago, at which the different congregations connected with the Society, both in the Town and the County, made arrangements to send petitions to Parliament, which were unanimously signed by all parties. Certain gentlemen present on that occasion thought it right to address the Members (for the Riding). Accordingly, letters were addressed to Mr. Wortley and Mr. Denison. I am sorry to say, with respect to the former, that the result was not what we wished it to be. Since that time, I have received a letter stating, that a Meeting had been held in Sheffield, which came to the unanimous determination, that—whatever this Conference might do—they were determined to co-operate with them. With respect to our Town Members, I must remark, that I unfortunately differ from them in politics; and I am the only representative in Town, with one exception. We had expected another. I have not yet seen Mr. Ward.

The Rev. W. M'ILWAINE, from Belfast.—I do not know whether I am in order in rising, but there is a matter to which, if I do not shortly refer, I shall not do justice to those whom I represent. It is in connexion with a paragraph which has appeared in the papers, respecting a Petition emanating from the Town of Belfast. I think, Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, that I am entitled to set that matter right. I was called upon the other evening, when not prepared to address you on the subject with sufficient clearness; and I believe the statement I then made will not go properly before the Public, if I do not take this opportunity of explaining. I will, with your permission, read the paragraph referring to this Petition. "Sir Robert Peel presented a Petition from Belfast, in favour of the proposed Grant; it was signed, he said, exclusively by persons of the Protestant Religion,—by the most respectable Bankers and Merchants—by the Gentry and Clergy of the Town of Belfast, who took this opportunity of expressing their decided opinion in favour of the Measure." Now, Sir Culling, I came to this Conference, principally for the purpose of giving a most decided contradiction to that statement. I am the only representative from Ulster, and represent at least five thousand persons. These persons are of the operative class; but they have amongst their leaders one Duke—the Duke of Manchester, one Earl—the Earl of Roden, and every gentleman who deserves the name of Protestant in my part of the Country. The Petition from Protestant Belfast was signed by five thousand persons. It emanated from a Meeting consisting of nearly two thousand persons, at which the Earl of Roden presided; and his Lordship told me, that he had never before been present at such a Meeting. This Meeting is, as it seems, to go for

nothing, as an expression of the opinion of the Town of Belfast. The Petition presented by Sir Robert Peel was signed, we are told, exclusively by persons of the Protestant Religion. Sir, the persons thus stated to be of the Protestant Religion are mostly the Arians of that Town; who, I am glad to say, bear a very small proportion to the population, and they are becoming less and less every day. There are also a few persons, who are Members of orthodox Communions. Sir, we are told that this Petition was signed by Bankers. I say, it was not signed by one Banker; for, I believe, individuals who are Directors or Shareholders of Joint Stock Banking Companies are not entitled to that appellation. (Hear, hear.) Further, it was stated, that this document had been signed by the most respectable Merchants, Gentry, and Clergy of the Town of Belfast. Now I say, that it was not signed by a single Minister of any orthodox Denomination in that Town. (Hear, hear.) I have said, that I stand here as the representative of five thousand brother Protestants—(I might quadruple that number, if I pleased;) but I hold in my hand a document, which, if read, would show, that I represent every Minister of the Established Church in that Town. Now, I think, if I have come from Ireland merely to contradict this statement, made with respect to the Petition from Belfast in favour of the Bill, my visit will not have been in vain. (Hear, hear.) I feel very unwilling to trespass for a moment on the time of the Meeting; but I am an Irishman, and I had something to do with the prolongation of these Meetings, in order that there might be opportunity given to Deputies from Ireland to speak. Ireland has been styled the battle-field of Protestantism; and let us remember, not only that Ireland is the battle-field, but that there are soldiers and sufferers in that field. (Hear, hear.) If you want to know what Ireland is really going through at this time, you must have representatives from that Country. And I would just throw it out as a hint—I hope you will pardon me for doing so—that I hope this will not be the last Meeting of brother Protestants in London. I hope you will have a Conference, in which your Irish brethren's voices will be heard.

JAMES BATEMAN, Esq., from Congleton, in Cheshire.—I come here to represent both Churchmen and Dissenters; and, though they are not a very large body, the indignation of the inhabitants at the unconstitutional attempt of an unprincipled Minister, to force his Popish measures on a Protestant people, knows no bounds.

The Rev. JOHN STEPHENSON, Wesleyan Minister, from Great Grimsby, Lincolnshire.—I have called upon Edward Heneage, Esq., and he stated his firm determination to vote for the Third Reading of the Bill. He said, however, that he was open to conviction; and he intimated that, if any arguments sufficiently powerful could be adduced, to show that he was pursuing a wrong course, that course he would abandon. From the conversation which I had with him, I think there is very little prospect of any such arguments being brought to bear upon him. I wish to state a fact in reference to North Lincolnshire. Many of the Clergy of that part of the Country—though they have not sent representatives to this Meeting—and I believe they have had no communication with it—have exerted themselves in getting up Petitions against the Bill. I was apprehensive lest it should be



supposed that this was not the case. It is a satisfaction to us to know, that there are operations going on in certain quarters, which have not been formally reported to this Conference.

The Rev. S. MINTON, from Stoke-upon-Trent.—There are two statements, which, I think, deserve notice and reprobation. One is, that the Romish Church is idolatrous *in practice*, but not *in doctrine*; and the other is, that, when a Gentleman swears that Popery is idolatry, he does not wish to be in the least committed to the statement, that the Church of Rome is idolatrous. (Laughter.)

The Rev. W. VEVERS, from Derby.—I had an interview, at the House, with Admiral Dundas. I said to the Admiral, “Before I go into the Gallery, I must have some talk with you about this Bill. I want you to oppose it.” He said, “I voted for it at first; I also voted for Mr. Ward’s proposition; and, the House having rejected that, I am determined to give the Bill my most determined opposition.” I was privileged to sit in the Speaker’s Gallery. I observed, that there were *THREE PRIESTS in the reserved seats of the House*; and I am quite sure that they were men of considerable influence, from the circumstance that several Members were in constant communication with them.\* I regretted exceedingly that we had no communication of that kind with the Members who represent us. (Hear, hear.) I think we ought to take a lesson from the tactics of these parties. Allow me to say, that I think we are greatly indebted to Mr. Plumptre and Mr. Colquhoun for the manner in which they have acquitted themselves; but, at the same time, I felt exceedingly sorry, that there was no person who seemed prepared to grapple with the great Theological question. Sir Robert Peel, in a manner which I shall not describe, got up and said, that the very same sentiments which were taught in Maynooth were taught in Paley; and that appeared to satisfy the House. Now I do think, that the great Theological question ought to be forced on the attention of the House; and there ought to be something done to ensure that, in the next Debate, that part of the question may be brought out fairly and fully. Permit me to add, that our other Member, Mr. Mundy, is also against the Bill.

The Rev. S. A. WALKER, from Meath.—I come from a rural district in Ireland, where I have an opportunity of seeing the working of Popery and the character of the priesthood, and of judging what are likely to be the results of this Maynooth Grant, if carried. You will bear with me, Gentlemen, when I say, that I was a little disappointed the other evening at Exeter Hall, to hear *the priests* treated with something like undue indulgence. Sir, I have thought—(this is not my first appearance in this Country)—that the matter is a little misunderstood *here*. I do not think you know well the genius of Popery; I do not think you know well the character of the Romish priesthood. I think you have been in the habit of looking upon them, with a degree of sympathy which they do not deserve; and I think *that* sympathy has degenerated into something like weakness on your part, and has paralysed your exertions against the dark system, which, I hope, we all feel to be fearful in its character. Sir Robert Peel has introduced this measure to the House, as

---

\* This fact is worthy of special attention.—EDITOR.

one which will benefit Ireland. Sir, if he knew what Popery was, and what the books taught at Maynooth were, he would (as my dear friend Robert M'Ghee says) as soon think of dethroning the Queen, as of encouraging the priesthood in the inculcation of a system, which has *that* for its ultimate object. Whether it be regarded theologically or politically, it is a dark and deadly system, and highly pernicious to the Country. As Churchmen, as Dissenters,—and at all events as Christians and Protestants,—we could not give it our support, if we knew what it was. Sir, I hold in my hand a report of a speech of the Rev. Robert M'Ghee, which I heard some time since,—which enters largely into detail regarding the books in which the Romish priesthood are instructed; and I wish from my heart, that it was in the hands of every gentleman here:—it contains a great deal of information upon the subject. I would beseech my Protestant brethren, of every Denomination, when they return home, to take this practical course,—Clergymen to collect their Congregations;—all to collect those who feel any anxiety to be acquainted with the subject: and I do not think they could do a better thing, than make them acquainted with the character of Popery, and the nature of the books which the priests use at Maynooth. I have often thought, that we have been doing good by opening your eyes to the character of the system. I look upon these Meetings as being of the greatest importance; because I think they will lead to inquiry, and that *that* will be the practical result. I cannot tell what we ought now to do in this matter. But at least go home, with your hearts and tongues engaged in the cause; raise the cry amongst your countrymen from one end of the Country to the other. Tell them, that they have been asleep; tell them, that they have forgotten what their forefathers have said, and done, and suffered; point to the fires of Smithfield, and ask them, whether they wish for the return of Popery? for we in Ireland see and feel, that, whether they like it or not, it is advancing, step after step, and stride after stride. I implore you to consider the matter from this time forward; and not to act as if you were acting from political motives; but as if you were acting for the very existence of your Protestant Constitution and your Protestant Religion.

The Rev. W. BUNTING.—I wish some Irish gentleman would settle the dispute between Mr. Wise on the one side, and Mr. Colquhoun on the other, as to the fact of certain books being used.

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—The real state of the case is this. I believe some Member rather hastily mentioned "*Dens*" as a class-book at Maynooth. I believe *Dens* never was taught there. (Hear, hear.) But *Bailly*, and others whose names have been mentioned, are used. The most authentic statements will be found in the Parliamentary Report of 1826; and from that Report, Gentlemen who wish to write or speak on the subject should derive their information. (Hear, hear.) *Dens*, though not a class-book at Maynooth, has been proved by Mr. M'Ghee again and again, to be a book which the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland did some time ago, in their official letters, recommend to be used in the periodical examinations of the clergy of their respective Dioceses, to see whether they were sound in the Popish faith, and in Anti-Protestant bitterness of feeling. In those examinations, *Dens* is used still. It is a sad mistake, to quote indiscriminately books used by the Priests

in Ireland, and to say, that they are used at Maynooth as class-books, when that is not the case. I have no doubt they are read, well enough; but on such a point it is desirable to avoid mistake.

The Rev. W. VEVERS.—I think it is due to Mr. Plumptre distinctly to state, that he declared that he did not quote from Dens; and I think it is due to Mr. Colquhoun to state, that his authority was the very Parliamentary document which has been referred to.

The Rev. A. S. THELWALL.—I would just beg leave to remark, that there are three names to be kept especially in view upon this question—Bailly, Delahogue, and the Commentaries of Menochius.\* (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, I have received a letter, to which I think it right to refer, because it bears on an important point to which I have already adverted. It is a letter from another gentleman returning me his ticket, and saying, that he is obliged to absent himself; one of that small

\* These are Class-books, which the Students at Maynooth are obliged to purchase at their own expense.

It may be well in this place, for the information of Protestants, to subjoin a list of Books which are used there. There are two classes of these books. The first is, as returned by the Professors, in a Parliamentary document,—the Appendix to the Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Education, p. 449,—

“*A list of the books used in the different classes of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, and which the students ARE OBLIGED to procure at their own expense.*”

Among these books are the *Commentaries of Menochius*. (Three vols. quarto.)

† The *Dogmatic Theology of Delahogue*. (Five vols.)

† *Bailly's Moral Theology*. (Five vols.)

† *Cabassutius on the Canon Law*.

These are the Class-books of Maynooth. But there are other books used in this College, returned by the President, under a different head, p. 450:—“*A list of the works recommended by the professors of the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth for the perusal of the students, or referred to by them in the course of their lectures.*” The President explains the use which the Professors make of these books,—that they refer to them only on particular points, which they are supposed to treat more at large, or more correctly, than the Class-books.

In Moral Theology there is *Collet*. (Seventeen vols.)

The *Deux Conférences d'Angers*. (Twenty vols.)

† *Antoine*. (Six vols.)

In Canon Law there is † *Van Espen*. (Fourteen vols. quarto.)

† *Devoti*. (Four vols.)

† *Reiffenstuel*. (Five vols. folio.)

Then, as returned by the professor of the Sacred Scriptures, the Commentary of *Cornelius à Lapide*. (Ten vols.)

† The Commentary of *Maldonatus*.

† *Bellarmino*. (Four vols. folio.)

Then, as returned by the Professor of Logic, the *Secunda Secundæ of Thomas Aquinas*. This book requires most especial attention, on account of the important place it holds among the Standards of the College of Maynooth.

[Those marked with an † are to be found in the British Museum; and copies of all of them have been placed in the Libraries of Cambridge and Oxford, with other important documents bearing on the same subject.]—EDITOR.

minority who felt it their duty to withdraw. This letter completely contradicts the statement in the *Morning Chronicle*.

The Rev. G. D. CULLEN, of Leith.—I am known in Scotland as an advocate of the Voluntary Principle; and I hope I have advocated that principle consistently. It is therefore not out of place for me to state, that, along with my friends from Scotland, I have felt very keenly the step to which reference has been made, and the mis-representation (as I may call it) in some of the public prints, of the ground on which that step was taken. I have felt so keenly, as a Voluntary Dissenter, that I have been at the Office of one of the papers this morning, with a letter from myself—disclaiming all sympathy with those who have acted in this manner: and I am happy to have an opportunity of stating, that I have, personally,—and I think I may speak also for my friends in Scotland,—no such feeling as seems to have actuated these gentlemen. (Hear, hear.) We have gone through the struggle in Scotland; and we are now, I think, come to this common ground,—that we all feel, as Protestants, that it is our work, at this crisis, to oppose the National Endowment of Popery at Maynooth. (Hear, hear.) That is the ground to which we confine ourselves; and I, as a Voluntary—attached as I am to the Voluntary principle, and whilst I would take every proper means of advocating that principle,—should be ashamed of it, if it prevented me from uniting with all true and faithful friends of the Protestant cause, in opposing the National Endowment of Popery. (Cheers.) I must conclude these hurried observations, made on the spur of the moment, by saying, that I cannot but congratulate yourself, Sir Culling, and this Conference, upon the good temper and the kind attention which have been shown to every member of it.

The Rev. Mr. ROSSELL, Wesleyan Minister, from Swansea.—I had an opportunity this morning of conversing with Mr. Vivian, the Member for the town of Swansea,—who, as you are all aware, on the First and Second Reading of the Bill, voted in favour of it, upon the grounds of Civil and Religious Liberty. I took the liberty of reminding him, however, that, where Popery prevails, there is no Religious Liberty, and but little of Civil Liberty. (Hear, hear.)—I referred to Spain and Portugal, and to some other countries. After a lengthened conversation of nearly two hours, he gave me to understand distinctly, that he would not vote for the Third Reading. He observed, that he had committed himself on the question by having voted for the First and Second Reading of the Bill. I told him, that I thought the matter stood in a different position now, from what it did in the former stages,—reminding him of the failure of Mr. Ward's motion. He seemed to fall in with that view, and with some other remarks which I made; and he told me, that I might return to Swansea, and tell my friends that he would not vote *for* (I have hopes that he will be induced to vote *against*) the Third Reading.

The Rev. G. S. BULL, of Birmingham.—The Gentlemen from West Bromwich took an opportunity of calling on the Members for South Staffordshire yesterday morning; and they have reported, that they are necessitated to return home. A deputation, consisting of eleven individuals, waited yesterday upon Lord Ingestrie, and presented to him a memorial signed by

nearly two hundred electors, and informed his Lordship of the very strong opposition which was felt among his constituents generally to the very obnoxious measure before Parliament; and, though he did not promise to vote against the Third Reading, he expressed a willingness to support a clause, to confine the grant to a period of not more than five years; and also to support a clause for the supervision of the instruction. I can assure the gentlemen on my left who referred to the debate, that Mr. Wyse and Sir Robert Peel have got into a tremendous mess; and that on Monday this will be seen. (Hear, hear.)

E. CHALLINER, Esq., from Tunstall.—I think it is due to the people of Tunstall, whom I am deputed to represent in this Conference, to say, that they are determined, so long as they remain either Christians or Englishmen, to oppose this Bill.

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, I have received a communication from the Rev. Mr. Lamb, a Deputy from Darwen, urging, that the Meeting, on its rising, should adjourn to Wednesday next. I will put this matter before our friends; but it occurs to me, that the best way of meeting the suggestion would be, to propose that the Committee should meet on that day; that it should be an open Committee; and that any Deputies, who may happen to be in Town, should be invited to attend. (Hear, hear.) I think that will quite answer the purpose intended; whilst it will prevent the Conference from being considered as sitting, in its representative capacity, when it cannot be so in reality.

The Rev. R. M. LAMB, a Clergyman, from Darwen.—The reason why I have made this suggestion is, that there are a number of Deputations, who could not attend this week; and who, expecting that this Conference would last more than a week, purpose coming up next week. If the Conference were continued for another week, I am confident that many parties from Lancashire would attend; particularly as there are some great Meetings to be held next week, at which they contemplate being present. They could not possibly leave the Country during this week. And I think it will be advancing the cause for which we are assembled together, to let the Members of Parliament see, that it is not an evanescent feeling, but a firm and decided purpose which actuates us; and that we shall carry on our opposition to this Bill as long as we possibly can. It would give an opportunity for many of the Deputations, who have come up, to speak, who have hitherto been prevented. I, for one, have not been able to see our County Members; because I am expecting the arrival of two or three more who will accompany me.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think, as I said before, the object will be accomplished, by having an open Meeting of the Anti-Maynooth Committee. The gentlemen of the press can come to that Meeting, as they would come to a Meeting of the Conference.

The Rev. J. W. THOMAS, from Oxfordshire.—I represent fourteen Societies and Congregations in Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire. I am not aware that there is any other representative of Oxfordshire. Ours is an agricultural district; and you know, Sir, that it is not very easy to move an agricultural population. Nevertheless the Bill before Parliament has moved our agricultural population. Our Congregations, twenty-two in number, in

the two Counties, are entirely and unanimously against the Bill ; and I beg to say, that Petitions in opposition to it were in course of signature, before we had heard a word from London, and before we had seen any form. I have seen two of our County Members this morning. Mr. Henley had voted against the Bill. I was in conversation with Mr. Harcourt for an hour and a half. He received me in the most affable manner. After he had heard my statement, he gave me an account of the whole of his Parliamentary life,—which he went into, to show, that he is consistent in advocating the present measure ; and he proved, I think, that he is consistent. I have been endeavouring to combat his reasons, which are altogether independent of Religious considerations,—although he is a son of the Archbishop of York. (Hear, hear.) I need not state the arguments which I used ; but I am sorry to say, I did not expect to be able to move him, after the correspondence which had taken place. His mind is certainly made up on this subject. He thinks, however, that if Sir Robert Peel had known what would be the extent of the feeling against it, it is very likely that he would not have introduced the Measure. (Hear, hear.) He builds a good deal upon the evanescence of the feeling which exists. This feeling is not, he says, unprecedented. He mentioned instances, in which propositions on the subject of the Catholic claims, having been met by a feeling quite as intense as this,—that feeling passed away when the Measure was carried ; and he thinks, that, when this Bill has been carried, the present feeling in reference to it will die away in the same manner. I endeavoured to show him that he was mistaken. I have seen the other Member, Lord Norreys. He has voted in favour of the Bill on both occasions ; and I am sorry to say, he seems disposed still to support it.

The Rev. C. PREST.—I would only just say one word. It is, that—if our friends from the Country could make it convenient to call on Members who have voted against the measure, they ought to do so. I do not think any of them should confine themselves to visiting those who are in favour of it. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN.—Sir William Seton, of Aberdeen, has a motion of some importance, to bring before the Conference.

Sir WILLIAM SETON.—The motion, Sir, which I have to make, will, I am sure, approve itself to this Meeting of representatives of the Protestants of Great Britain, as a most becoming one, and as one which we should not separate without adopting. That motion is, Sir,

“ That the most cordial thanks of this Conference be presented to those Members of the House of Commons, who, acting as the Representatives of their Protestant fellow-countrymen, have disregarded the ties of Party, and the complicated difficulties attending a resolute opposition to the Bill, and have opposed it in its various stages.”

(Cheers.) As this motion was only just put into my hand, I am not prepared to enforce it by any lengthened speech. But I cannot help making one or two remarks. When we consider the principles by which these Gentlemen have been actuated, it may, at first sight, appear, that—these principles being so superior to everything else—such a motion is unnecessary. But,—considering the difficulties with which they have to contend, and the sacrifices which they

have to make,—none but those who know what the ties of Party are, and how difficult it is to get rid of them, and the other ties which are sometimes broken in consequence, can conceive the credit due to those who have thus acted. (Hear, hear.) Besides, there are Members who have made substantial sacrifices. (Hear, hear.) I cannot help here alluding to a Gentleman who has been a determined opponent of Popery throughout his public life; and who, though tempted to continue in the trammels of office for the sake of the emoluments arising from it, has yet made the sacrifice; I allude to Mr. Pringle. (Cheers.) Sir, while all that we can do is, to give these Gentlemen our best thanks, I hope the Country, on meeting them again when they return to their constituencies, will give them cordial support; and that they will find, that *this* is but the expression of the substantial regard which we feel for them. On the other hand, I hope that those Members, who have taken a different course, will meet with something substantial too. (Laughter.)

Mr. ALDERMAN BURD, of Manchester.—I beg to second the motion which has now been proposed. I think that our thanks are especially due to those Members who have been open to conviction; and I hope we shall be able to induce a few more to support our cause. (Hear, hear.)

The motion was then put from the Chair, and carried unanimously.

The Rev. G. S. BULL, of Birmingham.—I beg, Sir, to move the following Resolution :—

“That this Conference desires to record its devout gratitude to Almighty God for the character and results of the present Conference; for the unanimity which has marked the whole of its proceedings; \*[notwithstanding the secession of some members of the body, differing only in the mode of their opposition to their measure;] for the number of Deputies composing it, unprecedented in the history of the Country; for the spirit of kindness and mutual forbearance which Gentlemen, heretofore unaccustomed to act together on public questions, have been enabled to exercise; and for the testimonies which have been furnished, from all parts of the kingdom, and from all classes of Her Majesty's subjects, of determined and almost universal opposition to the Bill for endowing the College of Maynooth.”

Mr. Chairman, that Resolution is both a Resolution and a speech; and I certainly should feel disposed not to accompany it by any observations of my own, if I did not feel constrained to express my most hearty concurrence in it. I certainly must say, that my own experience, as a member of this Conference, and a Deputy from an united body of Christians in the little village of Birmingham, has been such as to gratify me exceedingly; and I shall carry home, I am sure, to my constituents, my most unfeigned satisfaction, and shall share the same feeling with them, at the unanimous and kind manner in which the proceedings here have been conducted. There has been a mutual forbearance, a mutual confidence, a disposition to give way to each other, and to stand aloof from all those points of dispute which exist among us, and from anything that could create hostile feeling. And I do feel convinced, that, when a great crisis like this arises, it is possible,—with proper Christian discretion and forbearance,—to maintain our own principles inviolate, and yet to

\* It was afterwards agreed, that the words included in brackets should be omitted, and that the Resolution should stand as in page 160.—EDITOR.

act together with great cordiality and union. I think that, in this Conference, we have given a most triumphant answer to one of the best written parts of Bellarmine's works,—in which he attempts to prove that “the heretics” do nothing but quarrel with one another. (Cheers.) I have no doubt, that our enemies would have been glad to have had something to say on this subject; but, though perfect harmony was not to be expected, thank God for what has occurred. I do feel, that the Spirit of peace has rested upon us, and that the God of peace has been in the midst of us; and that we shall return home to our various localities with those feelings of Christian kindness, which it is necessary that we should all endeavour to cultivate,—and with that forbearance, which should be exercised, not only now but afterwards,—in order that, as far as possible, we may unite together for the common faith, and be ready to present an united front against our common foe. When the wolf gets over the wall, the sheep should run together; and, if they all turn their heads one way against the foe, they may hope to succeed. (Hear, hear.) I will not detain the Meeting further. I rejoice to have been a member of this Conference; and I shall always think it one of the happiest circumstances in my life, that I have been thus permitted to mingle with my brethren and my friends. But, at the same time, I would most earnestly impress upon the Meeting, that, with regard to all those points which have been mentioned by my friends on the left (and into which I am not going to enter) there is, in the Eighth Report of the Commissioners of Education, which I hold in my hand, a most complete refutation of Mr. Wyse and Sir Robert Peel. *I am not, and you are not*, to be deceived on this subject. A Gentleman who preceded me has expressed his regret, that there was not the necessary communication between ourselves and the Members who represent us, during the discussion in the House of Commons. It was not expected last night, that this matter would be debated. I believe there is a Lutheran minister in London, who intends to be present—I was going to say in that honourable House,—but I dare not use the words:—but I have no doubt, that a Lutheran gentleman will be able to present a memorial to that Honourable House; and that our old friend and father, Martin Luther, will be put in a very safe position.

The Rev. JOHN M'LEAN, of Edinburgh.—I beg to second the motion, and I rejoice to find myself thus in connexion with the sort of motion, with which, had I been left to choose, I should have desired to be connected. I greatly rejoice, Sir Culling, as I believe every man here does, in the extraordinary union which has been not only *seen* but *felt*; for union can be felt by those who are taught and enabled by God to feel it; and I rejoice, not only in the visible, but in the unseen and spiritual union, which I am persuaded has existed in the various meetings of this Conference, since we assembled together. I attribute it to the power of Religious principle—just the very thing which an eminent minister of my own Country,—Dr. Candlish, if I remember right,—said some time since, the Statesmen of the present day seem quite incapable of appreciating. (Hear, hear.) But, whatever other power they can calculate, they seem quite incapable of estimating the power of Religious principle. Without any effort, that state of union which we have observed here, has been brought about, through the pervading power of Religious principle, and the good providence of God in appointing such a



President over us. (Cheers.) Sir Culling, it must be felt by every one, and seen by every one, that there is operating here—and has been operating here from the beginning—a powerful feeling of that Religion, which, created in the heart of Luther by the Spirit of God, gave one of the first impulses to the Reformation. (Hear, hear.) I will not occupy any more of your time, and I have to apologise for occupying so much; but I would just remind myself, and my honoured friends of other Christian Denominations, that, for many years, I have identified myself conscientiously with the principle of Endowments. Yet I rejoice that my honoured friend and countryman, Mr. Cullen, —though he has taken the other view of that matter, has given utterance to such noble and Protestant feelings; and I believe, that he just represents the views and feelings of evangelical Christians in Scotland, with very few exceptions, wherever they are found to exist; and I doubt not, that, with the blessing of God, we shall, by-and-by, be enabled to make important changes in the Representation of that Country. I beg, however, to remind myself, that we have been brought under no more restraint, we have not done more to agree with one another in the Conference, than I suppose we have, as Christians, to do, in order to agree with each other in our respective Churches. (Hear, hear.) We really need forbearance to keep Wesleyans united; and, I suppose, our Church of England friends need forbearance to keep united among themselves; and I am sure other Denominations are in the same position. Let us take the same trouble, to keep on friendly terms with one another, that we find necessary in our own Church Meetings; and then, I trust, this will not be the last, nor even the most important, movement of this great Conference.

T. THOMPSON, Esq., of Poundsford Park.—I am very sorry, that other engagements have prevented me from being present until this morning. Allow me therefore to say, that we cannot but all agree to thank God for the spirit of affection, harmony, and union which has distinguished the Conference from the commencement. It is a very gratifying consideration for our minds to dwell upon. It has been said of that excellent woman, Hannah More, that she lived, and moved, and walked, in an atmosphere of love. I rejoice that you have met together in the spirit of love; and that, although some slight difference may have existed amongst us, we have reason to trust, that, by our engagements here, we have been preparing, in some measure, for that World, where peace and love and joy dwell for ever and ever. I, for one, would publicly return my thanks to Sir Robert Peel, for having caused us to meet together in such an harmonious spirit, that we have almost been carried back, as it were, to the days of primitive Christianity.

The Rev. Dr. BENNETT, of London.—I cordially and heartily approve of all the sentiments contained in the Resolution. But I would beg leave to suggest a slight verbal alteration. In one part of the Resolution are the words, “Notwithstanding the secession of some members of the body.” Now,—when such misrepresentations have been put forth in the public prints, with regard to the number of those who seceded,—we ought to guard against any misrepresentation of the Resolution which has been proposed. If there were no objection to substitute the words “a few members,” for “some members,”—that will secure the advantage of strictly expressing the truth,

and convey a truthful impression. I was in a good locality for observing how many left the room ; and it is my impression, that not more than six or seven Gentlemen retired. I beg to move, therefore, that the words "a few" be substituted for the word "some."

The Rev. W. VEVERS.—I am very willing to second that Amendment. It so happened that I was in the lobby when these Gentlemen left the room ; and I should say, the number was not more than half-a-dozen. Besides, if I understand the point correctly, they had never been admitted as Members of the Conference. They had refused to join it ; and why should we acknowledge them as members of the Conference, when that is the case ? (Hear, hear.) That Resolution was drawn up, Sir, I apprehend, before you made your telling speech this morning. You told us, and we all responded to what you said, that the weight of the fly was not felt by the ox. It appears, that we are now going to make a permanent record that it *was* felt. (Hear, hear.) I respectfully suggest that, as those Gentlemen never were members of the Conference, we ought not to make any allusion to them. (Hear, hear.)

T. P. BUNTING, Esq., of Manchester.—As the Resolution was originally drawn, the words were, "a very few members of the Conference." But Mr. Baines, jun., of Leeds, put it to me, how proper it was for us, to be as cautious as possible in our expressions ; observing that—although a very few Gentlemen only left the room—yet, as it was the first day of our proceedings, we could not tell, how many Gentlemen had declined to attend in consequence of their retirement. Therefore, on the ground of not having a dispute as to the form of our Resolution—

The Rev. Mr. VEVERS.—Why weaken our own strength by the appearance of—

The Rev. Dr. BENNETT.—I have great respect for Mr. Edward Baines ; he has done us noble service ; but I do not think it necessary, that,—upon a mere supposition, upon the mere abstract possibility, that some Gentlemen of whom we have never heard might have come, but for the circumstance of other Gentlemen having retired,—we should make an admission, implying the possibility that forty, fifty, or one hundred withdrew. (Hear, hear.) I do not propose the words "a very few ;" but I do propose that, in place of "some," we should say "a few."

The Rev. W. VEVERS.—I am not quite satisfied, that the parties who left were ever members of the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN.—I think I can set you right on this point. I have received a letter from Mr. Green, retiring from the Conference, and returning me his ticket. That settles the fact, I think, that this Gentleman was a member of the Conference. As to the other suggestion, that—although only a few went out of the room, others may on that account have absented themselves since—I beg to say, that the word "secession" implies an overt withdrawal. And therefore, we are entitled to say, that there was a secession of a few,—although some other persons may have subsequently tacitly and quietly withdrawn. My own impression is, that the seceders who walked out of the room amounted to six or eight ; and I think, therefore, it will be quite consistent with the fact to speak of these gentlemen as "a few."

The Rev. W. MOORE, of Truro.—Would it not be better to omit all

mention of those Gentlemen whatever? There may be others connected with these six or seven Gentlemen, and it will be better perhaps to observe perfect silence.

T. P. BUNTING, Esq.—The original object of this Resolution was, to meet the difficulty of the case. In drawing it up, it seemed to be desirable, to give a general expression of the opinion of the Conference, as to the whole character of the proceedings. But it had been represented, in some of the papers, in the *Morning Chronicle*, and I believe also in the *Patriot*,—that a large number of Deputies have seceded. Now, we wanted to tell the world, that a very few persons only had seceded from the Conference. The question was, how we should do that? The Chairman might have stated it from the Chair: but we were not sure that it would be reported to the public. A considerable impression had been produced in reference to this fact; the impression had gone abroad, that a considerable number of our body had seceded; and we wished to let the world know the fact, that only a very small number had taken that course.

The Rev. W. MOORE.—I think, if you publish a Report, that will get rid of the difficulty altogether.

The Rev. W. VEVERS.—Let there be a list of the names of the parties who constitute the Conference.

T. D. BUNTING, Esq.—But the public will not read that. It is important, as regards the public, and for practical objects connected with the House of Commons, that the impression which has been produced, that a large number seceded, should be removed.

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—Would you read the whole clause relating to this matter?

T. P. BUNTING, Esq.—“Notwithstanding the secession of some members of the body, differing only in the mode of their opposition to the measure.”

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—Although these Gentlemen had tickets, it must be remembered, that they took them, knowing the fact that they were to exercise a certain degree of forbearance when they came into this room. They said they could not, and withdrew from the Meeting.

The Rev. Dr. BENNETT.—I beg to read the following extract from the article in the *Morning Chronicle*:—“The same feeling (of dissent and displeasure) was still more strongly manifested, when the Rev. Messrs. Green and Stovel endeavoured to address the Meeting on a point of order; and a large number of delegates, perceiving that their continuing in the Conference exposed them to insult, and committed them to principles which they entirely repudiate, at once withdrew from the Meeting.”

The Rev. C. PREST.—The fact is, that these Gentlemen themselves, when they retired into the other room, as they stated, only mustered twenty, wherever they got them from. I am perfectly sure that not twenty left the room.

The Rev. W. VEVERS.—Was it not understood, that they were not to be members of the Conference, except on certain conditions? (Hear, hear.) Those conditions were not observed, and therefore I contend that they were not members of the Conference.

The CHAIRMAN.—O yes, persons are members,—although, after receiving a ticket, they secede. I think the word “withdrawal” would perhaps be better than “secession.” I think we should not be wrong in saying, “Notwithstanding the withdrawal of a few members of the body.” (Hear, hear.)

After some further conversation on this point,

The Rev. H. E. PRIOR, a Clergyman, from Dublin.—It does appear to me, with all respect, that the Conference, by making any reference whatever to the seceders, is doing their work; (hear, hear,) and that by far the most dignified course, and the course which is the least likely to wound Christian charity, and to continue unpleasant feeling, is to omit all notice of the fact in the Resolution. I would therefore suggest, that all reference to the fact should be omitted.

Mr. W. UPPLEBY, of Wootton.—What official notice have you had of the secession? Unless a member sends in his secession officially, you can scarcely recognise it at all. I understand you have had only one official resignation. (A voice, “Two.”)

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, allow me to make a suggestion. We have always conducted this Conference on the principle, that, if any individual objected to a particular course, it should not be pursued. Now, Gentlemen, reporters are sitting near you, and perhaps the reporters who are here will take notice of what has occurred. If the fact appear in the reports of our proceedings, that the number of those who left was exceedingly small, our object will be gained more effectually than by an advertisement in the *Times* and the *Morning Chronicle*. (Hear, hear.) At the same time, I do not want it to be seen, that we wish to press hard upon those Gentlemen. Therefore, perhaps it will be better, as some of our friends have suggested, to omit the reference altogether. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—I entirely agree, Sir, in your last sentiment. I think it is a matter of prudence and propriety, not to make too much of this secession. Why, we have made a good deal more of it in this discussion than could have been done in any other way. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. T. POWELL.—I would suggest the introduction of the words “general harmony.” (Cries of “No, no.”)

The question was then put from the Chair, that the Resolution should be adopted with the omission of the clause referring to the secession: with this omission the Resolution stood as follows:—

Moved by the Rev. G. S. Bull, of Birmingham; seconded by the Rev. John M’Lean, of Edinburgh; supported by Thomas Thompson, of Poundsford Park, Esq.;

“That this Conference desires to record its devout gratitude to Almighty God for the character and results of the present Conference; for the unanimity which has marked the whole of the proceedings; for the number of Deputies composing it, unprecedented in the history of the Country; for the spirit of kindness and mutual forbearance, which Gentlemen, heretofore unaccustomed to act together on public questions, have been enabled to exercise; and for the testimonies which have been furnished, from all parts of the kingdom, and from all classes of Her Majesty’s sub-

jects, of determined and almost universal opposition to the Bill for endowing the College of Maynooth."

"This was then unanimously adopted.

J. HAMILTON STORY, Esq., from Enniskillen, Ireland.—I have to apologise to you for the circumstance, that a voice from the Town of Enniskillen has not been heard earlier in these proceedings. I stand here as the representative of Mr. Barton, who was voted Deputy from that Town, in consequence of the circular of the Anti-Maynooth Committee; and who was empowered to bring the Rector, Mr. Porter, along with him,—or any other person whom he might choose to select. I am very sorry, I repeat, that a voice from Enniskillen has not been heard earlier in these proceedings. Captain Archdall, Sir Arthur B. Brooke, the Honourable H. A. Cole, have all voted against the Bill; the four Representatives there are all Protestants. On my own part, as an Irishman, I beg to return my thanks to the Protestant Deputies for taking up our cause so well. I do believe that Sir Robert Peel has very much erred from the right path. I have always understood, that the education of the Clergy of the Country ought to be in the Truth alone; and I should be very sorry to support any Establishment which has not the Truth for its end. I believe that the effect of giving this Grant for the education of the Priests will be, to increase the power of that class over a most intelligent and interesting people,—for such the Irish are. I trust that, in this cause, we shall go on and prosper; and I believe that,—as the town of Enniskillen has always said, 'there shall be no surrender,'—so there will be none as regards our object.

T. P. BUNTING, Esq.—I believe, Gentlemen, it is understood, that the business of this Conference will in a short time be brought to a close; and I am exceedingly anxious to impress on all the Deputies, the obligation under which we rest, to have a full attendance of the Deputies at the period when one of the most important parts of the business of our Meeting will be transacted,—I mean, a vote of cordial and unanimous thanks to the Chairman. (Cheers.) A Resolution, embodying what is plainly the sense of the Meeting, is confided to able hands; and I am sure every Gentleman would be ashamed if he allowed any engagement to take him away from what is a personal duty. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. J. W. THOMPSON, of the Free Church, Perth.—I have not thought it necessary to wait upon our respected Members. I am persuaded that almost every individual in this Country is as well aware as we are, of the distinguished part which the Honourable Fox Maule has taken upon this question; (hear, hear,) and my principal object in rising just now was, to give public utterance to the feeling which prevails in reference to the conduct of that Gentleman. At the same time I may state, that no individual would venture to show his face in Perth, who did not advocate the principles which, upon Protestant grounds, Mr. Fox Maule holds. I believe there will never be a Representative of Perth, who holds any other principles. It is to me a source of unspeakable satisfaction, that, on returning home to the bodies whom I represent,—comprising fifteen or twenty Congregations,—I shall be able to tell those Christian people, that their prayers have been heard. I believe I speak only what is true when I say, that there is hardly a family amongst our

people, in which, morning and evening, prayer has not been offered to God on behalf of this Conference. We regard this as a very important matter. It has come very close to our hearts; I never knew a subject in my life, which came so nearly home to the deep-laid feelings of my countrymen; and I am confident that they will cherish feelings of deep gratitude to God, for the evident signs of Divine favour vouchsafed to this Conference.

The Rev. JAMES EWING, of Dundee.—I would not trouble the Conference; but I fear that the large body who have sent me here would imagine, that I have not discharged the duty entrusted to me, if I did not take an opportunity of stating to this Meeting, their very warm attachment to the principles of our common Protestant faith,—their deep, decided, and determined opposition to the Grant to Maynooth,—and their readiness to co-operate in any measures which may be adopted, either with a view of defeating the Bill now before Parliament, or with a view of getting it erased from the Statute book at the earliest possible opportunity. I regret that I am the only representative of the members and ministers of the Free Church in Dundee. A proposal was made for the appointment of a joint Deputation; but there were some difficulties in the way of that, and the friends of the Free Church determined, that, rather than be unrepresented, they would send me alone to a Meeting, which they regard as the beginning of a united movement of the lovers of the Gospel throughout the world, in that conflict with the Man of Sin which is to result in his final overthrow. (Cheers.) I heard it stated, Sir, yesterday, that there were comparatively few Deputies from Scotland. It is not to be imagined, from this circumstance, that we are at all indifferent to the principles which this Meeting has met to advocate; for I am sure that, in no part of the United Kingdom, is there a stronger feeling in favour of Protestant principles than in my native Country, and in the community with which I have the honour of being connected. I beg to say, with regard to our Member, that we did not consider it necessary to call upon him. We have the happiness of being represented by one who does really represent the feelings of his constituents,—George Duncan, Esq., who voted against the Bill on the First and the Second Reading; and will do so, I have no doubt, on the Third Reading. I may say with confidence, that no one would have the slightest chance of being returned for that Borough, who was not one with us on this question. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. JACOB STANLEY, from Derby.—I waited this morning upon Mr. Strutt, to tell him, that a considerable number of his constituents had delegated to me the office of requesting, that he would give all the opposition that he could to the proposed Maynooth Grant. He received me with great courtesy; and, after an interview of half an hour, he dismissed me with great courtesy. He said he looked upon it as not at all a religious question. I told him, that we viewed it as a religious question most decidedly, and treated it as such; and that I did not see how a question relating to the Establishment of the Roman Catholic Religion could be otherwise than a religious question. I reminded him, that a letter had been forwarded by some individuals from Derbyshire to Sir James Graham, telling him, that the parties who signed some of the Petitions, were persons of no respectability and no influence. I told him that, so far as their respectability was concerned, it was enough to

say, that most of them—almost the whole of them—had the elective franchise; (hear, hear,) and that, at the next Election, the question about their influence would be very fairly tested. (Laughter.) I gave him to understand, in as delicate a manner as I could, that—unless he would consent to give this Measure all the opposition in his power—none of those petitioners would give him their votes. I was, however, sorry to retire, without any hope whatever that he will come over to our side.

The Rev. WILLIAM BURNET, from Holt, Norfolk.—I have a communication to make respecting Mr. Wodehouse, Member for East Norfolk. I had not the honour of waiting upon the Honourable Mr. Wodehouse, in company with my brother Deputy. In fact, Sir, I did not know, that the Honourable Gentleman was in Town; for, a few days ago, there was an advertisement in one of the Norfolk papers, respecting the absence of the two Honourable Members for that part of the County. Mr. Wodehouse said, that most of the opposition arose from this Meeting. When he was told of the character of this Meeting, he was very much surprised. When he was told what the Venerable Archdeacon Magee had said in this Meeting, relating to Sir Robert Peel's opinion as to the Church of England doing for England, the Church of Scotland for Scotland, while the Romish Religion should be the Religion for Ireland, he said, "Did Sir Robert Peel say so?" and on being assured that he did,—“Then,” he added, “Sir Robert Peel must be a fool.” (Laughter.) He also said, that the Minister who refuses to see a respectable Deputation, or determines on opposing the views and feelings of the people, is either a knave or a fool.

The Rev. W. TRANTER, from Alston, Cumberland.—I represent 1400 Wesleyans, who are all of one mind in opposing this measure. You know, Sir, that the Cumberland men throw all men with whom they wrestle. (Laughter.) Does Sir Robert Peel come from Cumberland, or from what County does he come? (A voice, “From Lancashire.”) Then he is sure to be thrown. (Laughter.)

The Rev. W. BUNTING.—I beg to move the following Resolution:—

“That certain Clergymen be requested to wait upon the Bishops; and earnestly and respectfully to solicit one or more of their Lordships, to take some early opportunity, as on the presentation of Petitions, of announcing their hostility to the proposed Measure; and also, in the event of its reaching the House of Lords, to conduct and sustain a strenuous opposition to it in all its parts and stages.”

I will tell you why I think, that such a Resolution as this should not be referred to the Committee, but receive the sanction of this Conference. In the first place, I think it will have the effect of keeping up, in the eye of the public, the peculiar character of our proceedings, I mean those of our Conference,—as it proceeds almost exclusively upon Religious principles. On that ground, I think it right, that the Conference should approach, and express its confidence in, those whom Mr. Robinson termed very properly “Ministers of the Gospel.” (Hear, hear.) In the second place, I think, that such an approach will be graceful on the part of a Conference which partakes very largely of a mixed character, and is composed extensively of Nonconformists. In Committee, I have often had to pledge myself to Clergymen of the Establishment, who

have had some fears as to the result of this Conference, that the Nonconformists,—the healthy portion of the Nonconformists,—would do their duty, would prove themselves Protestants, and give Clergymen of the Established Church no cause for pain. I ask whether that pledge has not been redeemed? (Hear, hear.) Whether it is possible for men to evince, as a body, more consistent and illustrious magnanimity, than have been evinced by my Nonconformist brethren? I now ask the Nonconformists in this Conference, to show the respect and confidence of those who do not approve of the position of the Bishops in the House of Lords,—I ask you to put confidence in them, as the publicly recognised, and (in my view) very responsible Representatives of the national Christianity, so long as they retain that position. (Hear, hear.) In the last place, Sir, I think this is the only practical, immediate measure which, after a good deal of reflection, I could recommend. I profess my respect for my own body, the Wesleyans. When I advised Mr. Fletcher to withdraw his amendment the other day, in favour of Dr. Halley's motion, it was, that we might avoid everything that could by possibility prevent unanimity,—that unanimity which has been a token of the presence of God in our assembly, and of the dominion of His Grace over our minds and hearts. It was not from a wish to do anything disrespectful. My present Resolution will prove to you my confidence in them. In five remarkable struggles against Christianity, they have done their duty nobly. I know from experience the value of personal intercourse and communication. I have accompanied my friend Mr. Bull, and others whom I see here, on two different occasions, in waiting on the Bishops; and they have proved the best men in Parliament in defence of Christianity. I think that, if Gentlemen wait upon them, to furnish them with certain points of argument, and to remove doubts and difficulties where they exist, they will do us essential service. Much as I respect the House of Commons, I cannot rationally entertain any hope that they will ultimately reject this measure; and not even a Bull from his Methodist Holiness\* would prevent me from saying, that, in my view, the present constitution of that House is scandalously irreligious; and that I, who have taken some pains to lift the present Conservative party into power, will in my own place, as a Minister of Religion, do my very best to help them out of power. (Hear, hear.) As to the House of Lords, they come upon us at present with unimpeachable character; and I do hope, that some one will do me the honour of seconding a Resolution, which I think is due to that branch of the Legislature to which it refers.

The CHAIRMAN.—I will make one suggestion before this Resolution is put. It is, that if it be adopted, it should appear as having been proposed, seconded, and supported, by Clergymen, Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists, and the representatives of as many bodies as possible; and I would suggest, that it should be presented by the Clergymen of this Conference.

The Rev. JAMES KELLY, of the Irish Establishment.—Perhaps I may be allowed to make one suggestion; and it is this, that Clergymen should be exempted from forming part of this Deputation. (Hear, hear.) I quite

---

\* Alluding to an expression used by Mr. O'Connell in reference to Dr. Bunting, the President of the Wesleyan Conference.



approve of the step which is proposed. I think you have a right to wait on the Bishops; and that you have a right to call them your Bishops, for they are the Bishops of the Church in this land. But when the Deputation waits upon them, that Deputation may state to their Lordships, that the Clergy—knowing that they had other opportunities of approaching their Lordships—did not think it necessary to be included in the Deputation. (Cries of “No, no.”) It is a fact, that the Clergy have other ways of obtaining access to the Bishops—(hear, hear)—and I am quite satisfied, that the Clergy have improved these other ways of access. I think there would be some embarrassment caused, by the communication with them of a mixed body; and that is the reason why I submit, that the Clergy should be exempted; while at the same time the information is given, that the Clergy have identified themselves with this assembly. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. J. T. ROBINSON, Rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn.—Gentlemen, I am not prepared to say at this moment, how far or not I might concur in the views of my Reverend friend behind me. It is a proposition on the part of this Conference, which I think requires from me a great deal of consideration. I should be very happy to consult with my brother Clergymen of the Church of England upon this matter; and to gather their opinions on the subject. But there are many considerations, connected with the peculiar position of the Church at this moment, which render it desirable that such deliberation should take place. I am sure I shall be permitted to say, that no gentleman here will question for one moment, the manner in which I have endeavoured to act heartily with this Committee, and with the members of this Conference. (Hear, hear.) I am sure I shall not be suspected, therefore, of entertaining the slightest idea of going back. God forbid that I should be such a traitor to my Country, to my Religion, and to my God! Will you allow me,—as I am speaking on the measures which are in progress, for bringing the combined influence of this body to bear upon the Bishops in the House of Lords,—to make a statement bearing on that point? I took upon myself to procure a meeting of my Clerical Brethren in London yesterday; and, as an influential paper, *The Britannia*, has given a succinct account of that proceeding, perhaps it will be convenient if I read the passage:—

“An important Meeting took place on Friday morning, at the parish-room of St. Andrew's, Holborn, for the purpose of arranging measures in defence of the Christian faith, by the Clergy of London, and other Dioceses. None but Ministers of the Established Church were present, and the Meeting unanimously came to the Resolution of adopting the following Address to the Metropolitan, through the Bishop.

“We recommend it as a model for the addresses of the Clergy throughout the Country. It is respectful without being sycophantic, and strong without imputing motives. In the few cases where the Bishop *may* be hostile to the prayer, the Clergy will have only to send their address direct to the Archbishop. Of course it is intended, that the same form should be pursued with respect to the Archbishop of York, and the Primate of Ireland:—

“To his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan.

“We, the undersigned Rectors, Vicars, Curates, and others, the Clergy of the

diocese of London, approach your Grace with every sentiment of respect for your Grace's eminent station and personal character.

"Being convinced, upon the grounds alike of Scripture and the Constitution of this Country, that the proposed Endowment of the Popish College of Maynooth is wholly inconsistent with the safety of the Church, the peace and prosperity of the State, and with the vows which we severally took at our Ordination, to support and hold fast the doctrines of Christianity, as revealed in the Holy Scriptures, we humbly entreat your Grace, with the Archbishops and Bishops of this great Protestant Empire, to resist to the uttermost, by all lawful means, within and without the Legislature, a measure so dangerous to the spiritual and temporal prosperity of the Realm."

"Then follow seventy-nine signatures.

"The Address will be placed in the hands of the Archdeacon of London, to be presented by him to the Lord Bishop of the Diocese.

"The value of so distinct an expression of opinion is obvious. The Clergy of the Establishment have been comparatively silent, not from any insensibility to the cause of Divine truth, but from the habit of waiting for the guidance of their Bishops. But on an occasion like the present, there is no time to wait for any one. \* \* \* Some of the Bishops may even be afraid of incurring the name of agitators, unless they evidently acted in *consequence* of a public call of their Clergy. \* \* \* The question is one of life and death."

We met yesterday afternoon; and, by to-night's post, I think, there will be letters sent to every Clergyman throughout the Empire; and I have no doubt the result will be, to bring such an expression of feeling, and such remonstrances to bear upon the Bishops, as will be crowned with success.

Mr. S. GILES, from Manchester.—I am sorry to offer a single remark, which may appear to be opposed to Mr. Bunting's proposal; I think the proposal is an extremely good one, viewed as a suggestion; but, on account of the mixed character of this Conference, I think it is not desirable that it should be adopted as a Resolution. It should stand, I think, simply as a suggestion, and not as a *bonâ fide* proposition.

The Rev. G. S. BULL.—I quite concur in the very considerate suggestion which has just been thrown out. Clergymen, in all parts of the Country, have met together, and already their Petitions are before Parliament, in opposition to this Bill. But still I think the Clergy here present should take into consideration the suggestion which has been made, if the Resolution is disposed of in that manner.

The Rev. J. W. THOMPSON, of the Free Church.—On behalf of the Free Church of Scotland, I beg to say, that I concur in that view.

The Rev. W. BUNTING.—My principal object was, not so much to influence the Bishops when the measure is before the House, as to induce them (as we know by experience they may be induced) to communicate their opinion on the measure, during its progress through the House of Commons. It cannot be denied, that the announcement of the opinion of a man like the Bishop of London, or the Bishop of Exeter, or the Bishop of Chester, as adverse to the Bill, would have an influence in their respective Dioceses,—combining the Clergy against this measure, in a manner which no other step could do. I do think it very desirable, that, before the Measure shall have advanced almost beyond the power of recall,—even through the House of

Commons,—the Bishops should be induced, by the personal representations and influence of the Clergy, to make a public announcement of their hostility to the proposal. Of course, I cannot but regret, that this Resolution does not emanate from the Conference; because I remember that, in many previous instances, when Conferences have met, quite as mixed in their character as this—such Resolutions have been adopted, and have been acted upon; and the Bishops have received the Deputations from the Conferences, with that Christian and catholic respect which is worthy of their station. Having made these remarks, I beg to withdraw the motion.

The motion was accordingly withdrawn.

The Rev. G. S. BULL.—I wish to make one remark, in reference to what has just occurred; it is, that the motion which has been withdrawn was prepared by Mr. Bunting, without any communication with those of us who belong to the Established Church. Permit me to say, that I was requested to move a Resolution, to the effect, that the Deputies should assemble their constituents in every locality, every town, village, and hamlet, to state the proceedings of the Conference, and to consult as to the steps to be taken, to stimulate the Electors to make known their wishes to Members of Parliament; and I have been confirmed in this plan, by the advice of several Members of both Houses of Parliament, whom I have seen since I came to Town. But I find, that this Resolution, or one of the same nature, has been already adopted, and I need not therefore propose it.

Mr. W. J. HOWARD, of Bedford.—I wish to observe, that a Petition has been placed in the hands of Sir Robert Peel, as the Petition of the Clergy and inhabitants of the Town of Bedford. That is entirely a misrepresentation: I assure you that the Petition in question was got up privately.

The CHAIRMAN.—I beg to inform you, very briefly, of a few matters of fact. A gentleman writes me word, that he has letters from the County of Cavan, saying, that the Clergy there are deeply indignant at this measure, and mean to act up to their feeling.

A gentleman from Durham says—"I have seen our two Members; but I regret to say, that I was not able to make an impression in favour of our cause."

A Clergyman,—who mentioned to me a circumstance in a letter yesterday, as to the transmission of intelligence, by a Government messenger from the Government of this Country to the Court of Rome,—consults me as to whether any further reference should be made to it. It seems to me to be a matter of such serious importance, that—unless the facts can be fully substantiated—I should strongly advise, that it be not stated as a thing that is certain. Therefore I hope that the press, and all gentlemen present, will understand, that nothing of this sort is asserted as true. (Hear, hear.) I do not think the thing can be proved.\*

A Wesleyan Minister, who has been obliged to leave London for Man-

---

\* The reply of Lord Stanley to a question put to him by the Duke of Newcastle, in the House of Lords, seemed clearly to admit, that there had been negotiations with Rome, in one shape or other. And persons have been *recently* named, who are said to know the facts.—EDITOR.

chester, says, "My duties at Manchester prevent my continuing for the sitting of this day. I express my great satisfaction, that, throughout, nothing has required any compromise of principle,—either by the advocates of Establishments, or by those of the Voluntary Principle."

A Clergyman from Ireland, Mr. Prior, has requested me to refer to the Isle of Achill. I am sure, that every one here must sympathise with those Clergymen, connected with the west of Ireland, who have been instrumental in the conversion of a number of Roman Catholics, and have afforded to them an honourable protection. All will be interested in reading the Paper, which is the organ of those gentlemen—*The Achill Herald*. Sometimes, in connexion with those discussions between Protestants and Roman Catholics, things have perhaps, been said on both sides, which ought not to have been said; but, notwithstanding that, I am sure we must all sympathise with the gentlemen to whom I have referred.

On the motion of T. P. Bunting, Esq., of Manchester, the Chair was then taken by Sir W. C. Seton, Bart.

The Rev. J. T. ROBINSON.—Gentlemen, and brother Christians and Protestants,—the moment has now arrived, when our Conference is drawing to a close; and, at this interesting period, certain general duties devolve upon us, and certain individual duties also. One of the latter, I feel most unworthily, has devolved upon myself. Sir William and Gentlemen, I rise at this time, at once to enjoy a private gratification of a high order, and to discharge a most important public duty. Allusion has been made to the unanimity, the charity, and the forbearance, which, under the blessing of Almighty God, have distinguished our consultations. Just allow me to refer, for a moment, to a passing event. We have been informed this morning, that a number of Gentlemen, who have considered themselves conscientiously bound to retire from this body, intend to make a demonstration,—by which, as it has been said, the public shall understand, what are the real grounds of the opposition of Protestant Dissenters to the Roman Catholic Bill for the Endowment of Maynooth. I wish, Mr. Chairman, to say this—if they do so, which I very much deprecate, let it be for us to show the Christian public, what are the grounds of Evangelical Protestant union against it. (Loud cheers.) Gentlemen, having rendered up our praises and thanksgivings, where they are most due, to our Almighty Father, and the Divine Head of His Church, for the unanimity and charity which have prevailed,—it now becomes our duty to turn our attention to matters of this lower world, and to record our gratitude to that distinguished man, under whose able presidency we have, humanly speaking, preserved that unanimity. (Hear, hear.) Permit me to say, in the indulgence of my private feelings on this occasion, it is not long that I have had the gratification of knowing Sir Culling Eardley Smith; but if I have not found in him a brother in political creed, I have found in him a brother in Christ. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, your Chairman, I confess, has taught me, and, I doubt not, has taught many of us, a lesson. He has taught us, that you may be firm without being factious—(hear, hear,)—that you may differ from a fellow-Christian without entertaining feelings of animosity;—(hear, hear,) that there is a path in which you may walk, in a spirit combining the "wisdom of the serpent" with the "harmlessness of the dove,"—

equally removed from laxity of principle on the one hand, and from party rancour on the other. (Cheers.) I need not dilate, except for a moment, upon the distinguished ability which has marked the presidency of this Meeting. We have found him prompt in action, Christian in spirit, able in counsel, learned in precedent and in history; but, above all things for our holy cause, we have found that he is a man who reads his Bible. (Applause.) I do not know, Gentlemen, how it may strike you, but I confess that his conduct has frequently reminded me of a beautiful and affecting passage in the Gospel,—I allude to the parable of the good Samaritan; and it is in this way. The Samaritan, in the bleeding and wounded traveller, saw not the Jew, he saw nothing but the man; and my friend—in the distracting parties into which, unfortunately, as fellow-citizens, we are divided—he saw not the Tory, the Whig, the Liberal, the high or low Churchman, the Dissenter of one denomination or another; he saw nothing but a body of Christians. (Cheers.) And I must be allowed to say, that it is from the elements that have been manifested in his character, that the truly great men of this Country have been formed—men who can sacrifice party prejudices, long-cherished feelings, when a mighty cause,—even that of God's Truth, of Religion, and of the welfare of their Country—is concerned. Such characters will survive the wreck of politics and the wreck of party; and posterity, Christian posterity at least, will do them the justice to hold them up for the imitation of mankind. (Great cheering.) One word more, Gentlemen, and I have done. There is a mistaken man in this Country, who would be considered the greatest man in the Empire—Sir Robert Peel. Sir, I affirm boldly, here is one who aims at greater things; (immense applause,) and, if it appeared in nothing else, it would appear in this, that,—while the one has endeavoured to combine together an heterogeneous mass of individuals of all sorts of opinions and classes in politics, for the sake of expediency,—the other, by holding up the Word of God as his rule, and giving to the battalions, I will say, of Christ's militant Church in this land, the one word, "Protestant and Christian principle,"—would bind together men, differing in many things, but united in this,—that they will defend, that they will live for, and (if need be) will die for, the eternal Truth of God. (Enthusiastic cheers.) The Resolution, Gentlemen, is this: I have the honour and privilege of proposing it, and it will be yours to give it your hearty acclamations. And before I read it, permit me to make a suggestion.—I throw myself on the sense of the Conference—it is this: If it meet your views, I would suggest that this Resolution should be engrossed, emblazoned, ornamented in any manner you please,—in any manner befitting the solemn occasion, the holy cause, and the deserving man to whom it is addressed,—and presented to him, in the name of the Conference. (Cheers.)

"That this Conference cannot conclude its sittings without expressing its grateful sense of the inestimable obligations under which the cause of Protestantism, in this empire, and throughout the world, and the members of this Conference, have been placed by the unremitting, zealous, and most able services of Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart.,—services invaluable in themselves, in their bearing on the great object of this Conference, but rendered far more efficient by the prudence, candour, and kindness by which they have been distinguished."

The Rev. Dr. BUNTING.—I had the great honour—for such I esteem it—of seconding the proposition, when we first met in Conference, that Sir Culling Eardley Smith should be requested to take the Chair; and I feel it an equal honour and happiness, to be permitted to second the Resolution which has just been proposed,—expressing our thanks to him for his conduct and services in that Chair. It is a very fortunate thing, to second a Resolution in such an assembly as this, when that Resolution has been moved in the eloquent and powerful manner in which this has been proposed. (Hear, hear.) It is perhaps a still more fortunate thing, when the seconder of a Resolution has to express his cordial approbation of a sentiment, which has been previously adopted by anticipation by the Meeting, whose concurrence in it is now formally asked. (Cheers.) Allusions have been made to this subject already by several preceding speakers. So full were our minds and hearts of a sense of the obligation which we owe to Sir Culling Smith, that several Gentlemen, whose Resolutions did not lead them to the topic,—unable to restrain their feelings,—have already given expression to them, in a manner which has elicited the strong and unanimous approbation of the Conference. (Hear, hear.) I will venture merely to add to the very able and eloquent speech of Mr. Robinson, one remark. Much as this Meeting has rejoiced to observe the urbanity, the kindness, the candour, and the Christian spirit, which have characterised Sir Culling Eardley Smith's conduct in the Chair of this Conference,—they can have very little idea of the amount and extent of the obligation which this cause had previously incurred to him. (Hear, hear.) The same distinguished ability, the same kind and conciliatory spirit, the same attention to every point which happened to be incidentally introduced,—which have distinguished his conduct in the Conference,—had, for the previous month, distinguished it—I was going to say, by night and by day—for he has been a Protestant operative indeed—(hear, hear, and cheers.)—in the meetings of the Committee. I for one, feel the strongest possible sense of respect and regard for him, and of gratitude to him for his services. I only wish, that his health, by the merciful providence of God, may be spared and established,—so that he may be able to continue those services, which as Chairman of the Conference he has rendered to us; and that some situation yet more distinguished,—not in reality, but as respects the common estimation of men in general,—in which he will have yet further opportunities of proclaiming the sentiments that we have so often heard from his lips,—may be afforded to him. (Cheers.) I beg with all my heart and soul, to second the motion.

The Chairman then put the Resolution, which was carried by acclamation,—the whole of the Deputies rising from their seats, and cheering with great enthusiasm.

The CHAIRMAN, (Sir W. C. Seton, Bart.)—Now, Gentlemen, I may be permitted, in one word, to relieve my feelings by saying, that I consider the great pleasure, which I have experienced in the whole of this Conference, as crowned by the privilege which I enjoy, of conveying this expression of enthusiastic feeling from the representatives of the Protestants of this Country to Sir Culling Eardley Smith. (Cheers.)

Sir CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, Bart., then rose to address the assembly, amidst renewed cheers. He said,

Gentlemen, and fellow-Christians, allow me from my heart, most cordially to thank you for the great kindness that you have done me. You have far, far over-rated any little services that I may have been able to render. (Cries of "No, no," and applause.) All that I have been able to do, has been, when this subject first came before the public, to perceive a fact,—I believe a most important fact, the most important phenomenon in the present state of our Country,—a fact guessed or known by every Christian man; but one of those spiritual things that cannot be discerned but by spiritual men;—namely, that the Children of God, however divided and separated among the different sections of the Christian Church, are yet thoroughly one in heart. And I felt perfectly convinced, that those parties to whom I have referred, not only, when the merits of this question came before us, would at once seize the true point of the question, and see that the interests of our common Christianity were at issue;—but also, feeling this—seeing the object to be attainable, and the necessity of striving for that object,—they would feel that it was their duty,—they would feel that it was practicable,—they would feel that it devolved upon them as the Christians of the year 1845,—to set the glorious example of acting together for the cause of their common Protestantism. (Cheers.) In so acting, none of them have abandoned, or in the slightest degree relinquished, any one principle of their own opinions. (Hear, hear.) For some purposes, it is right, that our Religious duties should be classified into primary and secondary. But that is quite consistent with this principle, that there is nothing in the Word of God, be it as minute as it may, to maintain which does not devolve, as a duty, upon every individual who thinks he sees it in the word of God. Therefore, Gentlemen, when I say, that justification by faith is the *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*, and while I attach unbounded importance to the doctrines called, by way of distinction, the Doctrines of Grace,—yet, Gentlemen, if some of us have learned from the Word of God, or arrived at the conclusion, that it is the State's duty to interfere as regards Religion, I say, that those men would be traitors to their principles, if they allowed any object of common Christian interest to prevent them, when so persuaded, from contending for that principle which they believed the Word of God to teach and sanction. (Hear, hear.) On the other hand, my dear friends, if there are those amongst us who have been led to a contrary conclusion, I think you will say with me, that it would be wrong on their part to forego what they consider right—even for the great object which has convened us together. (Hear, hear.) But neither the one nor the other has been done. (Cheers.) Perhaps this Meeting has taught all of us to appreciate, more than we have hitherto done, the arguments used by those to whom we have been opposed. I do hope and trust, that I have learned much from Churchmen;—I am quite sure, I have learned to respect them and their principles more than I ever did before. On the other hand, I believe Churchmen will be ready to say, that they have been glad of this opportunity of being brought into closer contact with their Dissenting Brethren. But this Conference, Gentlemen, has required no sacrifice on either side. If I might, for a moment, eliminate and put aside this and that minor characteristic, and single out the point which I think peculiarly characterises and crowns the proceedings of this Conference, I should say, that that point is

generosity. We have learned a lesson; we have not learned it from one another; but He who, I am sure, has been in the midst of us, has taught us that lesson,—which after all is but a Christian grace, put into moral phraseology—is but the love of the Gospel converted into its other name of generosity. He who has been in the midst of us, has taught us the lesson, that,—whilst, on the one hand, we all of us hold fast by that which He has taught us to be (as we deem) part of His Truth,—and whilst none of us are willing to forego any part of that lesson,—He has taught us, on the other hand, that, besides doctrinal Truth, there is also a spirit to be learned; and that, while we lay hold of, and continue to hold fast, the Doctrines of the Bible,—we should also desire to exemplify together more and more *the spirit of the Bible*, which is the spirit of love. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, for myself, I desire one thing—and I trust that you will remember it in your prayers, and that you will sometimes allow me to be the subject of your prayers,—I do desire, that, while gratefully acknowledging the kindness of my Protestant Countrymen, I may not be elevated by those kind expressions which my friends have used. I do hope, too, that you will all remember, that it is one thing, to be able to put forth principles in the midst of those with whom I agree—it is one thing to be able to enunciate points of Christian Truth in the midst of my Protestant friends; it is another thing, to be able to do that in the midst of those—many of whom would scorn the principles which I profess. (Hear, hear.) I therefore desire, by God's grace, not to confine the expression of sentiments expressed here, to assemblies such as this; but I pray, that God may give me grace, as having been connected with this Conference, to avow, in other and less favourable circumstances, the sentiments which you have permitted me to express. (Cheers.)

To descend, for a very short time, from the high ground which I have been occupying, and thanking you cordially for your kindness—allow me to refer for a moment, to one or two points, which seem to devolve upon us as duties, so soon as we shall separate. I trust—and this has been suggested to me as a topic to bring before you—I trust, that we shall feel it our duty to make use of the Press. (Hear, hear.) Ere we assemble again,—if unfortunate circumstances compel us to assemble—at least three weeks must elapse; and, during that time, great influence may be exerted upon public opinion, by a judicious use of the provincial press. It has been said, that many of the provincial papers are in the hands of those, who (without avowing it) are, from their connexions—some of them secret till hitherto, but now known—opposed to our Protestant views. But, Gentlemen, I do hope that is the exception. (Hear, hear.) I do believe that a large proportion of the provincial press is in the hands of those, who—if they are stirred up by you—will be ready to use on the side of truth, that powerful engine, that engine which God has given to the Christian Church to be used; and that engine which our enemies are using, our friends ought also to use. With some urgency on your part, it will be neither impossible nor difficult to bring the provincial press of this Country, to bear with such a force upon public opinion, and upon the Houses of Lords and Commons, that, humanly speaking, under God, and next to the immediate influence of this Conference—no greater influence could be brought to bear upon the decision which we are



anticipating. I therefore hope, that every individual who is present, and every individual who, through the press, may hear of this conversation, will feel it to be his paramount duty, during the next fortnight or three weeks, to make the utmost use in his power of the public provincial press.

Another topic appears to me to be also of some importance; and that is, our local organization for defeating the Maynooth Bill, and for Protestant objects. Gentlemen, that subject has been committed, by a public Resolution, to the Anti-Maynooth Committee; and I may here repeat, that I hope that Committee will meet in a few days, and will commit the consideration of the subject to a Sub-committee—will revise their report—and will be prepared, in the course of a few weeks, with something like a plan deserving to be put before the Country,—and (allow me to say again)—before Christendom. (Cheers.) But, Gentlemen, in the mean time, the question arises, What should be done in the way of local organization? Now I would suggest, as a general principle, as to anything like permanent organization, that—much as I should admire the exertions of our friends to keep up Protestant feeling, and to keep before the public Protestant objects—it is desirable, that there should be no premature organizations of Protestants in the Country. (Hear, hear.) I trust that in London the talent, the judgment, and the experience of our friends of all parties, will be brought to bear upon the question of the best mode of organization; and, that being so, I think it is highly desirable, that our friends in the Country should not endeavour to anticipate what may be proposed; but, as far as they can, wait to see what their Metropolitan friends will recommend. (Hear, hear.) But allow me to divide the subject into two parts, and to say, that—while it is not expedient that our friends should attempt permanent general organization—there ought to be immediate organization for the purpose before us. (Hear, hear.) I think it highly desirable, that our friends should meet, as we have met here, in a spirit of union, especially in those places where they have not met hitherto; and that they should form Anti-Maynooth Committees, in order to promote, as far as they can, the great objects which we have in view. And let me repeat again—as a duty which I think devolves upon me as Chairman—that one of our immediate objects ought to be, to endeavour to pour funds into the treasury of the Anti-Maynooth Committee,—which, I need not state, has been very much exhausted by the efforts we have been obliged to make. (Hear, hear.)

Dear friends, allow me once more cordially to thank you; and to thank God, that we have been permitted to meet together. I do from my heart thank God, that I have been brought into such close contact with my Christian brethren of all Denominations. My Christian friends, whether we are successful immediately or not—ultimately we must be successful. (Cheers.) The influence of this great Conference will not be lost; and, come what may in the course of public events, at least we shall feel, that there is a Protestant Catholic Church in this Country—(cheers)—that the word “Catholic” ought not to be monopolized by those who are infinitely more divided among themselves than Protestants are. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I trust we shall feel, that we have been brought together, in the providence of God, in order to feel and express that, more than we have ever

yet done. I trust that the Lord is beginning a great movement in the earth; and that His people are to be more closely and intimately united together; and if so, we know, how that is to operate upon the World; we know, from the 17th chapter of John, that our Lord prayed, that His people might be one, that the World might believe that His Father had sent Him.

If, therefore, we should now be entering upon that period of the World's history, think what an effect our union will have! I do hope that that period is coming. I think I can see, in the trembling and shaking of institutions, in the trembling and shaking of the kingdoms of the earth—a sign, that something great and wonderful is going to happen in our World; and I shall indeed rejoice, if our meeting together on this occasion shall be instrumental, in the hands of God, in furthering and bringing in the Establishment of that Kingdom, which is “righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost,”—and the extent of which is to be commensurate with the whole World. (Great applause.)

The Rev. H. E. PRIOR, from Dublin.—I have, by some mistake, been deprived of the great pleasure of seconding the vote of thanks to Sir Culling Smith; but that duty has been far better discharged by another member of the Conference. I was desirous, however, besides performing this duty, to make one or two observations in reference to the Isle of Achill; and, with that view, I wrote a letter to the Chairman before he left the Chair,—with fear and trembling, I confess, lest it should be supposed that an Irish conspiracy had been formed against the Conference. You need not be afraid of a speech. I have no value in myself as a part of the Irish Deputation, except as I serve as a finger-post, to draw the attention of my brethren to something valuable coming from others. As a Deputy from Ireland, however, I feel it my bounden duty to do the bidding of my constituents, and not to fall under the solemn and serious charge, which has been so often and so justly reiterated in reference to the Members of the House of Commons. I do take the opportunity, Sir, of assuring you and this Conference, that I feel the honour of membership in this Conference ten thousand times more than—if I were a layman, and fitted for it—I should feel the honour of membership in the House of Commons. I would rather be a door-keeper, Sir, in a Conference of solemn and serious-minded Christians, who fear the Lord and hate the Pope—(laughter)—I do not mean hate the Pope personally—I love him as a fellow-creature, but I hate him as the Man of Sin—(hear, hear)—I say I would rather be a door-keeper in such an assembly as this, than dwell in the high places of the earth. And, Sir, I do entertain an earnest and confident hope, that the members of this Conference will be privileged, under Divine Providence, to act upon the Members of the House of Commons, just as we are expecting the spiritual Lords to act upon the House of Peers. Let me observe, in reference to the recent conduct of Sir Robert Peel on this question, that I think he has been guilty of the greatest inconsistency. In a speech delivered by the Right Honourable Baronet on the Maynooth question, in the House of Commons, on the 23rd of June, 1840, he is stated, in *The Achill Herald*, to have made these observations:—“I cannot agree, that the system of education carried on there is a matter of indifference to the Legislature. I think that the system pursued at Maynooth is a legitimate matter

of consideration for Parliament, and that it would be an abandonment of duty, were the House of Commons to avow a doctrine, which would allow us to say to the Roman Catholic Professor, 'Here is the money, we are pledged to grant it, you may do with it as you please; inculcate doctrines subversive of order and injurious to morality; but we cannot interfere.' " Then, excusing his vote in favour of the Grant, on the ground that there had been an inquiry, he adds, "But if all those complaints were removed, I should vote for the Grant with much greater satisfaction than I do now, when so strong an impression prevails, that the system of education stands in need of improvement." Colonel Sibthorp expressed a doubt last night, as to the fact of Sir Robert Peel being a Protestant. Sir, I also express a doubt as to the fact of his being a Protestant. I do not express a doubt as to his professing to be a Protestant; but I do express a doubt as to his being one.

The Rev. A. S. THELWALL.—I beg to propose that we conclude by singing a hymn; but, before we do so, I would just make one suggestion of a Religious nature,—because I think a Meeting of this character should not separate, except under a deeply Religious impression. The sentiment which I would bring before you is this:—That we have peculiar reason to thank God, that he has brought so many Christians of various Denominations together, uniting heart and hand in a good and holy cause; and that we may hope, that this will lay the foundation of feelings and manifestations of more real Christian union than have ever before been exhibited on earth. I had put this thought into the shape of a *Resolution*, which it was at one time my intention to propose to the Conference; but, on consideration, I will give it you merely as a *suggestion*; and—because I shall convey my idea, at once more fully and more concisely, by using the words which I had written down—I will just read, *as a concluding suggestion*, what it did not seem advisable, at this stage of our proceedings, to propose as a distinct *Resolution*.

"That the Members of this Conference acknowledge, with humble thankfulness, the hand of their gracious God, in bringing together, by unforeseen events, so many Christians of various Denominations, from all parts of the Kingdom, to unite in maintaining the great principles of their common Protestantism; that they recognise herein a golden opportunity for the promotion of more close and cordial Union among Evangelical Protestants than has ever yet been manifested to the World; and, in order to the permanent maintenance of such Union, they pledge themselves to endeavour, in dependence upon the grace and blessing of their God and Saviour, to give that prominence and peculiar glory to the essential, saving Truths of the Gospel (in which all real Christians are and must be agreed)—in their meditations, their conversation, and their preaching—which will lead them to consider all other matters, whether of doctrine or discipline, in due subordination to those grand fundamental Truths."

I will not enlarge,—though it is a subject on which I could easily find much to say—but I desire, as a Minister of Christ, to leave just the ideas which are expressed in those words, upon the minds of my Brethren of all Denominations. I would now call upon you to unite in singing—

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow."

The Conference then sang the following verse :—

“ Praise God from whom all blessings flow,  
Praise Him, all creatures here below ;  
Praise Him above, ye heavenly host ;  
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.”

The Rev. G. S. BULL then repeated the following Psalm :—

“ God be merciful unto us, and bless us ; and show us the light of his countenance, and be merciful unto us : that Thy way may be known upon earth : Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God ; yea, let all the people praise Thee. O let the nations rejoice and be glad : for Thou shalt judge the folk righteously, and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God : yea, let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth bring forth her increase ; and God, even our own God, shall give us His blessing. God shall bless us ; and all the ends of the world shall fear Him. Amen.”

The Rev. A. S. Thelwall then pronounced the Benediction, and the Conference broke up.

## A P P E N D I X.

---

IN connexion with the assembling together of the Anti-Maynooth Conference, it was from the first proposed, that a Public Meeting should be held in Exeter Hall, for the purpose of receiving and welcoming the Deputations from all parts of the Country, and of giving to *some of them*, more especially, the opportunity of addressing their fellow-Protestants in the Metropolis : and it was considered highly desirable, that a Report of that Meeting should form an Appendix to the Report of the proceedings of the Conference, whenever these were published. This Report, accordingly, is here presented ; but it is right to state, that it was not taken by the same hand as the proceedings of the Conference, and that it was not written out till long after the Meeting took place ; it may not, therefore, be so full and accurate as it might have been, if the Reporter had been specially engaged to take it down, and had written it out while the whole was fresh in his memory. It is believed, however, that it will be found, on the whole, sufficiently correct and ample ; and, as one of the most important and remarkable Meetings that was ever held in Exeter Hall, it will be felt, by all who were interested in the Anti-Maynooth struggle, to be worthy of preservation in this volume.

Some sentiments were uttered by different speakers, which the whole Meeting was by no means prepared to adopt. This is not to be wondered at ; but it seems best, in publishing this Report, to allow each speaker to speak for himself ; and only, here and there, to subjoin a note, to intimate the difference of opinion and feeling which was expressed by some present,—who were equally zealous in their opposition to the Endowment of Maynooth, but could have wished, that *the common ground* of opposition had been more carefully maintained and insisted upon throughout, than was done, or than perhaps was possible under all the circumstances ; for, doubtless, the circumstances of excitement, and the shortness of the time that was allowed for preparation and

arrangements, made it necessary for all parties to exercise mutual forbearance, in regard to what was spoken in the warmth and feeling of the moment. It will, therefore, be understood, that, while the Resolutions were drawn up with care, and must be considered as expressing the deliberate judgment of the whole Conference,—each speaker must be considered as responsible for his own particular sentiments, and was prepared to bear with his brethren, who could not, on all points, go along with him. And all would agree, that it was much better, in the spirit of mutual love, to bear with the utterance of sentiments, on some points, which differed from their own, than to restrain too rigidly the expression of honest convictions and feelings,—which would have given a cold and constrained and formal character to the whole Meeting ; and would thus have detracted much from the warmth and sincerity by which it was characterised, and which made it altogether so truly delightful.

---

#### MEETING IN EXETER HALL.

ON Thursday evening, May 1st, 1845, a most numerous and respectable Meeting was held in the Great Room, Exeter Hall, “to protest against the Endowment of Popery,” by the proposed Grant to Maynooth. With the object of giving the demonstration a more impressive character, ladies were excluded from the Meeting. The area of the hall was filled, at the time appointed for the commencement of the proceedings, (half-past six;) and soon afterwards, the platform, the spacious hall, the side galleries, and the large western gallery were crowded. The assembly consisted exclusively of the male sex. Besides the provincial Deputations, there were on the platform many Metropolitan Clergymen and Dissenting Ministers.

At twenty minutes to seven o’clock, on the motion of the Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel, Sir CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, Bart., was called to the Chair, amidst the acclamations of the assembly.

The Meeting was opened with prayer, by the Rev. G. S. Bull, of Birmingham.

Sir CULLING EARDLEY SMITH, Bart., (the Chairman,) then said,—Gentlemen, I am struck, even at the commencement of my address to you, with the altered circumstances under which we meet. I felt myself impelled by long habit to say, Ladies and Gentlemen ; and it was not until I had time to correct myself, that I refrained from doing so.

A GENTLEMAN in the body of the Meeting.—Why were ladies excluded ? I think the reason ought to be stated.

The CHAIRMAN.—I must require order, if you please. I confess, for one, that it takes away something of one’s energy and satisfaction, in seeing only gentlemen present ; and I have no doubt, that many ladies, who would have been here to-night, will feel great regret, that circumstances have pre-

vented their admission. But I am quite sure, that they would be the first to say,—as we, I trust, shall be equally ready to say, “If our presence on any occasion would interfere with a great National object, we would be the first to desire to be absent.” And, inasmuch as it has been frequently said of Exeter Hall Meetings, that a large proportion of the auditors were of the fair sex,—at least that imputation (if an imputation it be) cannot be made against *this* Meeting; and it will go forth to Parliament, and to Her Majesty’s Government, that the Meeting assembled to-night in Exeter Hall, was one in which not one of that sex was present, who might be supposed to be influenced by feelings of excitement, and an undue partiality; but that it was an assembly of men—of Englishmen, who came forward to exercise a manly judgment upon one of the greatest questions that ever affected the destinies of our Country. (Cheers.) I regret that you see me occupying the Chair this night; because I entertained great hopes, that the Committee would have been enabled to obtain the assistance of some one, more suited in many respects than myself for the post; and inasmuch as I have been put very prominently forward upon this subject before you already. One Noble Lord, who was communicated with by your Committee this morning, but for certain circumstances, would have been very happy to be present with us,—I mean the Marquis of Breadalbane. (Applause.) You will excuse me if I do not address you in so orderly a manner as I could wish; but I have been working at this question day after day, and have hardly had time to get necessary rest. I say, the Marquis of Breadalbane would have been very happy to be with us this evening; and the gentleman who waited upon his Lordship, was instructed by him to say, that when he last attended,—when he presided at a previous Meeting,—he had some little doubts about the propriety of our proceedings, and the object for which we were assembled; but that now every one of those doubts was altogether removed. (Cheers.) I am authorised to say, that the Marquis will leave no stone unturned in order to promote our object. (Cheers.) And, moreover, his Lordship earnestly calls upon us, to exercise every constitutional power and privilege we possess, to prevent the Endowment of Popery. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, I am happy to report to you, what many present are cognisant of from their own observation, that the proceedings of the Anti-Maynooth Conference, to-day and yesterday, have been conducted, I think I may say, with the utmost success; and I am sure I may add, with perfect harmony. (Hear, hear.) It is one of the most remarkable phenomena of this remarkable age, that many hundreds of gentlemen, from different districts of the four departments of the kingdom—England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales,—gentlemen who have never met together before, and not only coming from different parts of the kingdom, but connected with different sections of the Christian Church,—Churchmen and Dissenters,—men of all ecclesiastical, and of all political parties,—bound together by that one bond which unites us—attachment to the doctrines of the Reformation—attachment to the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ;—it is remarkable, I say, that these men should have been able to come unexpectedly together, and to have transacted the business that has been transacted, with that harmony, forbearance, and good feeling, which I, for one, never witnessed before in my life. (Loud cheering.) Gentlemen, I am not without hope that the proceedings of our one

day's debate, which have already been reported, have not been without their effect upon the public mind, and *that* in the highest quarters. (Cheers.) In dealing with those public men, to whom it is our misfortune to be opposed at present, we know, from past experience, that it is very difficult to say what any movement or proceeding on their part may indicate; but it certainly is a very remarkable fact, that, from a concurrence of circumstances, it was announced to the House of Commons only this morning, as the result of last night's Debate in Parliament, that the Third Reading of the Maynooth Bill was postponed till the 19th of May. (Loud cheers.) Gentlemen, I do not know what the effect of this announcement may be upon the Country; but I can only say, that the effect of it upon my own mind has been, to give me the greatest possible encouragement. (Cheers.) It looks as if there were misgivings and waverings among those who are opposed to us; and we know that, when once the ranks of the enemy are broken, there is no saying how soon the whole army may be routed. (Cheers.) We therefore feel encouraged more than ever, to proceed in all those steps which we have already set before us; and others also, which appear to us more expedient to be taken. We by no means yet despair of the result in the House of Commons. (Cheers.) And if you had been present this morning, at the meeting of our Conference, I think you would have arrived at the same conclusion. Gentleman after gentleman got up and stated, that he had waited upon his Representative; and I think there was scarcely one communication made to us, that did not hold out something like a hope, that a beneficial change in their opinions might take place; and, as far as that question was referred to at all, I believe there was not a single Member, who did not admit, that the Anti-Maynooth feeling throughout the Country was infinitely greater and stronger than anything he could by possibility have anticipated. Therefore, Gentlemen, we are not without hope in the House of Commons. (Hear, hear.) But, Gentlemen, failing the House of Commons, we know,—as subjects of these realms,—that our political Constitution is composed of Queen, Lords, and Commons; and we do feel, that we have a strong refuge in the House of Lords. (Cheers.) And we do not forget,—and I trust that neither Churchmen nor Dissenters will forget, that we have individuals sitting in the House of Lords, who are the official Representatives of the Protestant Religion of this Country. (Cheers.) At our Conference this morning, we agreed to a Petition, to be presented to the House of Lords, of no ordinary character; a Petition which underwent no ordinary examination; a Petition which underwent an extraordinary degree of patient and forbearing criticism; a Petition which received a mature consideration, which I could not have supposed could be shown by several hundreds of gentlemen, met together for the first time. Gentlemen, we agreed to a Petition to the House of Lords, in which we not only set before that august House the object for which we have petitioned; but in which we, purposely, went largely,—not into political views—not into discordant views—but into the view which, as Christians, we take of the sufferings and of the claims of the people of Ireland. (Hear.) We state, that we do sympathize with them in their sufferings. (Cheers.) That we are anxious, by every legitimate means, that the notorious sufferings of the people of Ireland should be mitigated; but that we object to pay for the support



and extension of a Religion which we believe to be erroneous. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) But, Gentlemen—failing the House of Lords, and supposing for a moment, (what I am very loth to anticipate) that the measure should not only pass the House of Commons, but that it should pass the other House also even a single stage,—even should there be a mere formal Reading in the House of Lords,—we have come unanimously to this conclusion, that it will be the duty of the Conference to re-assemble from every part of the United Kingdom. (Loud cheers.) That, in the mean time, the Deputies should return to their own districts, and immediately convene those by whom they were sent, and state to them all that has occurred; should consult with them as to the matter I am about to mention; and that, if circumstances of necessity should require it, those Deputies shall return to London, prepared to take practical steps, to rouse the millions of our countrymen who are opposed to the Bill, to Petition Her Majesty to dissolve the present Parliament. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) Gentlemen, I feel more confident than ever I did, that, at one or other of those stages, the victory will be ours. It is possible—it generally happens with great questions—that the turn of the tide does not take place exactly at that point at which we expect it; but at some other point. Gentlemen, I feel confident, that the Almighty Being whom we serve, and in whose Name we are assembled, will *eventually* give us the victory; and that, whoever may be in Downing-street, or whoever may be out of it, Statesmen of all Parties will learn the important lesson, that, though they may effect changes with reference to the secular interests of this Country, yet that, with the Protestant Religion of the people of England, it is neither their duty nor their province to meddle.

(The whole assembly here rose, and continued cheering, amidst the waving of hats and handkerchiefs, for some moments.)

Gentlemen, I thank you for hearing me so patiently. I can assure you, that I am considerably fatigued, in consequence of the many employments cast upon me in the course of the last few days; and therefore I trust you will forgive any errors or defects you may discover in me. (Cheers.) I will now call upon a gentleman, with whose name you are acquainted, to move the first Resolution.

The Chairman then called upon

The Rev. J. T. ROBINSON, Rector of St. Andrew's, Holborn, who on coming forward was warmly cheered. He said,—Gentlemen, the Resolution which has been committed to my charge, to move on the present occasion, I will now read :—

“ That this Meeting, composed of Deputies from all parts of the United Kingdom, and holding various Religious and Ecclesiastical opinions, unite in expressing their conscientious and determined opposition to the Bill now before Parliament for endowing the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth; and that a Petition, founded on this Resolution, be signed by the Chairman of this Meeting on behalf of the Meeting, and presented to both Houses of Parliament.”

Before addressing myself more immediately to the Resolution, I am glad to take this opportunity of congratulating you, Sir, the Anti-Maynooth Committee,

and the Protestant public at large, upon the demonstration which is at this moment made in this Hall. Sir, it is remarkable, after the number of meetings that have taken place on this subject, that we should still find the feeling not upon the wane : but that the determination of the Protestant public is permanent upon the subject : and it does seem to me, as if the Protestants of this great Empire were determined to arise as one man, and to say, " Nothing shall separate us from the love of Christ." (Loud cheers.) And, Sir, how comes this to pass ? It arises, I think, from this circumstance ; that, among all the designations that have been applied to meetings of this description—whether in this place or elsewhere,—that, while they have been called meetings of Protestants, meetings of fellow Christians, meetings of true Britons, if there is one designation which applies to them more than any other, it is this, that the present meeting, and all meetings like it, are *Bible* meetings. (Cheers.) Yes, Sir, *the Bible* is the foundation of our unity on the present occasion ; and *that*, in opposition to a Church which would say, (in opposition to the command of our Blessed Saviour,) " Search *not* the Scriptures." (Cheers.) Sir, and Gentlemen, it is when men find themselves joined together *in unity of Faith*, that they see the importance and duty of *unity of action*. What, Sir, is the great question that, in point of fact, is now proposed to the people of this Country ? It is that which was proposed to the people of God many ages ago : " How long halt ye between two opinions ? If the Lord be God, follow Him : but if Baal, then follow him." (Cheers.) And, Sir, when this question is brought home to a man's heart,—when it is so palpable and so plain, that it becomes criminal to hesitate,—then it is, that men, prayerful and religious men, take counsel with the oracles of God. The question is not then, what this man may say, or what that man may think ;—it is not, what our right-hand neighbour, or our left-hand neighbour, may determine ;—it is not what this or that arrogant Statesman may think proper to dictate to the Country ;—(cheers,)—but the grand question then comes ; " On whose side is God ? And on whose side is Truth ?" (Cheers.) It is then, that all who hold the Head,—all who are truly Christians, unite together in Christian zeal and charity,—throwing overboard all party feeling, and minor differences,—exercising mutual forbearance, and preferring conscience and God to Party, in the defence and maintenance of their common Faith. (Cheers.) I do believe, Sir, (though I should be unwilling on many occasions and many subjects to admit the principle,) I do believe that, in this great and momentous matter of National interest, " the voice of the people is the voice of God." (Great cheering.) I say, that only such persons as those I have described, can properly be members of a Meeting like this ; and I believe, that it is by the union of such men, that this great movement is now so successfully going on ; and I do believe that, under the blessing of God, in answer to the prayer of His people, it will be brought, in defiance of the kings of the earth, and of principalities and powers, to a successful termination. (Cheers.) Men actuated by the principles I have described, amidst all the discords and conflicts of human passions and human opinions, will see afar off, but still clearly, the bright and sunny land of Truth. Such men will not listen to Party suggestions or Party feelings : no, they will say, " Let the dead bury their dead :"—these things are for time ; I am for eternity : these are of a

Party; I am for mankind : these are for the world ; I am for my God. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, I do believe in my heart and conscience, that the movement now going on in this Country in favour of our common Protestantism, by the blessing of the Almighty, which (as I have witnessed) has been supplicated in devout prayer, will be successful ; and,—so long as your trust is in Him who has promised that He never will forsake His Church,—there can be no doubt of the issue. If we are true to our God, He will be true to us ; and we shall not fail to attain at last,—not for ourselves, but for Him and His glory,—a great and consummate triumph. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, will you permit me to occupy your attention, for one moment, upon a matter,—somewhat personal to myself, but not unconnected with that great and glorious Cause in which you are engaged. A certain Hon. Gentleman, in another place, (laughter,) has done me the kindness—has given your great Cause the advantage, and (I will take the liberty of saying) has done himself the dishonour, (hear, hear,)—to notice a short but emphatic speech of mine in this place. Of that notice I do not complain ; but I do complain of the manner in which the notice was made. That gentleman—affording a specimen, I suppose, of pro-Maynooth courtesy—did me the kindness, and I will repeat, did himself the dishonour, to commit the un-English act of abusing me behind my back. (Hear, hear, and great cheering.) I recollect being once in the gallery of the House of Commons, when I heard a Noble Lord, now a Member of the Government, say, in allusion to an expression used in “another place” by another Hon. Member of the same house,—I will not pollute this assembly of Gentlemen, by repeating the language that was used by that Hon. Member. (Hear, hear.) I agree with the Noble Lord to whom I refer, that the House of which he was a Member, should be an assembly of Gentlemen. (Laughter.) I am not disposed to dispute the rule ; but, after what has occurred with regard to myself, I will take the liberty of saying, that the Hon. Gentleman to whom I allude, the Hon. Member for Sheffield, (Mr. Ward,) constitutes the exception to the rule. (Loud cheering and laughter.) I have a right to say this ; because,—when I stood up here in my character as a Christian Clergyman, as a Protestant, as an English Gentleman, and delivered my opinion on this question,—that Hon. Gentleman stated, in “another place,” that my expressions had filled him with “unutterable loathing and disgust.” (“Hisses,” and cries of “Shame.”) What I said on that occasion, I will upon the same spot, and with the same emphasis, reiterate. (Cheers.) I said that Popery was “damnable idolatry.”\* (Loud and prolonged cheering.) I said, Sir Robert Peel had adopted a false principle, if he supposed that this measure, being calculated to raise the intellectual standard of the Romish priesthood in Ireland, would therefore make them better men ; because I had yet to learn, that increased knowledge would render men of bad principle better men. The Hon. Member to whom I refer, honoured me with no

---

\* This expression is used, in the Third Part of the Homily of the Church of England, “Against Peril of Idolatry,” in reference to the Idolatry of the Church of Rome : so that Mr. Robinson was only using the language of the Church, of which he is a Minister.—EDITOR.

argumentative notice ; I will honour him with none ; but I will beg leave respectfully to give him a little advice. It seems to me, that he has not only violated the principles of gentlemanly conduct, and of proper courtesy between man and man ; but that he has gone out of his way—he has stepped out of his province ; that he neither understood the subject, nor his own duty. I think he is but an indifferent judge upon the matters of practice as to which he lectures me. I presume he would impute to me bigotry and intolerance ; but I beg to tell him that I hate bigotry and intolerance as much as I love truth. (Cheers.) I think he must be a bad judge of matters of practice, because I believe him to be a bad judge of matters of faith ; because, from all that I have seen of his senatorial efforts in Parliament, I cannot tell ; whether he believes all Religions equally true, or all Religions equally false. (Hear, hear.) I will venture to submit to him a little advice, in the shape of an old proverb, which I will not give him in the original,—which I might give him in Scriptural language that might probably excite his scoff ; but which I give in homely words, (and he can translate it if he likes, into parliamentary phraseology) “Let the cobbler stick to his last!” (Laughter, and cheers.) I did not introduce this subject to gratify any personal feeling of my own ; but because I felt it due to this assembly, and to the brave and intrepid men with whom I am associated in this movement,—in spite of obloquy, and scorn, and ridicule, and every impediment in their way ; and more particularly, I may be permitted to say, because that distinguished champion of all Protestant interests, the Rev. Hugh M’Neile, was included in the sarcastic attack. I have a right to protest against this line of conduct being pursued in a Legislative assembly ; it is disgraceful to an Englishman, and to the Assembly in which he spoke. (Laughter.) Gentlemen, returning more immediately to the matter before us, I take my leave of you, with one or two emphatic remarks ; and beseech you to remember this, that in conducting this great movement, as far as you individually are, and personally may be concerned, there are two grand duties for you to perform. There is a duty which you owe to your Protestant ancestors, and a duty which you owe to your posterity. “Remember,” said a great Statesman once in the British Senate, when he was imploring them to consider the consequences of their actions, “that you are legislating for posterity.” (Hear.) And I say to you, remember that you are agitating this great question for posterity ; and,—though we have, for obvious reasons of a prudential kind, excluded our lovely fellow-subjects, the ladies, from this Meeting to night,—still I am doubtless addressing fathers and brothers ; and I say to you, when you go to your homes, tell them, fathers, that it is for the benefit of your children you are agitating this question ; and when you bend your knees in prayer, and collect around you, as I trust you often do, your children, your household, and your families,—recollect, that you cannot lay your hand upon that blessed book, the Bible, which is the standard of your devotion and of your faith,—without remembering, that to preserve that Book of all books, your ancestors shed their blood in this Country ; that their blood, and the smoke of their torments, went up to heaven ; and, by the fires of persecution, the history of that persecution is burnt, as it were, into the very stones of the streets of this Metropolis. (Hear, hear.) I say, tell your children to remember this. Go

forth into the world, and into all your political and social connexions; and, whether it be by Petition, or by remonstrance,—whether it be addressed to the House of Commons, or to the House of Lords, or to the Throne,—still never let your exertions relax. Remember, that it is a question of life or death. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) One word with regard to that last measure which has been under discussion to-day,—with regard to petitioning our Gracious Sovereign: we all love her. (Cheers.) How is it that we love her most? Is it not as Protestants? We love her as our *Protestant* Queen. (Loud cheers.) I say, then, let the Petitions of her people go to her; and let them honestly, respectfully, and candidly, and in a truly friendly spirit (as truly friendly it will be) tell her this, that the true divinity that doth hedge a monarch is,—in all her thoughts, words, and deeds, to prove her allegiance to the Lord of lords, the King of kings, and the only Ruler of princes. (Cheers.) Act upon this principle, my dear friends; and then it will belong to a future age to say, in looking back upon the proceedings of this day, that indeed it is a glorious record in the archives of Britain, which states how Protestants came forth, under these circumstances, to lift up their voices, and cry aloud for God's Truth; and that our posterity will say, while surrounded,—as God grant they may be!—with all the privileges, Civil and Religious, of our Protestant Constitution,—“We owe these to the independent, unflinching, staunch Protestants of 1845.” (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

The CHAIRMAN.—An old and tried friend of the Protestant Cause, but who has long been laid by, yet is determined, notwithstanding some inconvenience, to come forward upon this occasion, will second the Resolution—Captain Gordon. (Loud cheering.)

Captain GORDON.—Were I to consult my own feelings, or the advice of my physician, or the dictates of common prudence, I certainly should not presume to intrude myself upon this Meeting to-night. But, Sir, I have been selected, by a very influential section of my Protestant brethren, to represent their principles and feelings upon this occasion; and I am willing, to the extent of my crippled faculties, to address myself to the task. Certainly I should have hesitated to comply with the earnestly expressed wish of my Protestant brethren, in the district which I have the honour to represent, but that it is in my power to direct the attention of you, Sir, and of this most important assembly, to an event which I conceive may have some stimulating influence upon the Protestant constituency of Great Britain. I am at present a sojourner in West Kent,—a district which has recently had the opportunity of expressing its sentiments with respect to this question. A vacancy took place in consequence of the death of the Earl of Romney; by which event, Lord Marsham was translated from the Lower to the Upper House of Parliament. It then became a question, a most anxious question, who should succeed that Noble Lord, in this crisis, in the Representation of that County in Parliament. The question was debated, and anxiously debated, amongst those who conceived themselves invested with a right to express an opinion upon it; and at last it was agreed, that a most respectable, influential neighbour, Lord Holmesdale, should come forward as a candidate for the Representation of the County. He was selected for the reason, that he could exert a more extensive influence than any other resident land proprietor in that County. He is a man of most

excellent understanding, and a man of active business habits; a popular Nobleman; one who in all respects was considered a most fitting man to embody, unite, and concentrate the Conservative feeling of the County; a man least likely to produce a split in the Conservative camp. He would have been a most unobjectionable Representative; and I speak of him as a man deservedly respected. Naaman was a great man, "but he was a leper." It was very soon discovered, that our pet Candidate was a decided supporter of the Grant to Maynooth. I learned this circumstance through a private channel. I immediately wrote to the only two influential individuals with whom I was acquainted in the County, to say, that, if it was intended to force this Candidate upon a reclaiming Protestant constituency, I would sternly, steadily, and uncompromisingly resist him to the last. (Cheers.) And that, if we were compelled, upon this occasion, to accept the nominee of an aristocratic landlord, I would proceed, from the moment of his Election, to construct an Elective apparatus, which should effectually overlay the electoral machinery of the County; and the question which we would ask in future would be—not, "Are you about to support the tenant or the landlord?"—or, "Are you about to snap asunder the ties which hold society together?"—but, "Are you resolved and determined, to hold fast the connexion which holds man to his God?" (Cheers.) But, Sir, the protestations of the few who were opposed to the nomination of a pro-Maynooth Candidate were considered to be very ineffectual. A very considerable body of men, who are generally looked up to as the beacons of public opinion, were unanimous upon the subject; and it was their wish, that the minority should be silent. But the minority would not be silent. They next resolved upon making a public appeal, and they carried out that resolution; and it was soon discovered in the district, that Lord Holmesdale—popular as he was—would have been absolutely without support. (Hear.) In the parish of Hadlow, where I reside—which contains upwards of forty voters—it was discovered, that not more than two out of the forty would have been doubtful even. I found in the district surrounding me, that the feeling was the same throughout; nay more, that the same feeling existed in all parts of the County. Captain King, having possession of an estate in the County, having influence, and being defeated in another place, united the Committee together, by becoming our Chairman; and, from that moment, all hopes of the success of Lord Holmesdale vanished. At the next Meeting, held very soon afterwards, at a Meeting of the Central Committee, that Nobleman, in a very handsome manner, came forward; and, rather than expose the County to a contest, and the Conservative Party to division, offered to retire, with the consent of his Committee, provided that another Candidate, Mr. Frewen, who had been brought into the field, should retire also. Therefore we were in the position we wished; and we determined to have a Candidate, to the heart's core a Protestant, and a resident in the County—I mean Colonel Austin. Now here is an appeal made in the face of England,—an appeal made to one section of the constituency of England; here is a body of independent Protestants, who expressed their determination, to disregard all considerations but the consideration of principle, and to address themselves to the fulfilment of a great Protestant duty; and—without any reference to the peculiar

political opinions of their supporters, or to the influence that ought to be brought to bear upon them in their various conditions, and from various quarters—determined to express their sentiments in favour of the return of a Protestant Candidate. (Hear, hear.) Now, Sir, if that was practicable in one County, it is practicable throughout England. (Cheers.) I believe, that the same feeling, which actuated the County of Kent upon that occasion, pervades the general constituency of this Country. Certainly I am persuaded, that it exists among the same class in society ; —the class to which I allude is *the middle class*. (Hear.) It was observed by the French philosopher Voltaire, that the English character very much resembled a butt of its own porter ; froth at the top, dregs at the bottom, soundness in the middle. (Hear, and laughter.) I am not prepared to say, that the Protestantism of this Country will precisely answer this description ; that it is exclusively dregs at the bottom, or exclusively froth at the top ; but certain I am, that it is excessively sound in the middle. If we would have wholesome beverage, then, we must tap the cask halfway up. (Hear, and laughter.) To speak in plain terms, we must address ourselves to the sound, unvitiated class of society ; we must address ourselves, mainly and especially, to the middle ranks of society ; we must fall back upon that latent stock of Protestantism which resides in that body. There is, to use a horticultural expression, a great deal of the bottom heat of the Reformation in that soil. The upper stratum has been rendered effete by vicious cropping. The lower has not been reached ; we want a sub-soil plough, and you are, or have been, constructing such an instrument. You, Sir, have been more efficient than any individual, within or without these walls, in constructing the subsoil plough. We must plough down the surface, and plough up the centre ; and that will yield a great reward. (Cheers.) We have been twitted with our divisions. It was considered in the County of Kent, that, if the Conservative party split, the Whig and Radical parties would immediately insert a candidate in the chasm, and the Conservative would be pushed aside.

(Mr. Plumptre at this moment entered the Meeting, and was greeted with loud cheers. When silence was restored, Captain Gordon resumed.)

I was observing on the remarkable feature which characterised the movement in West Kent. It was plain, that, should there be a split, the Whig or Radical candidate would take advantage of it. I saw, from the first moment the question was agitated, that it would be impossible for either Whig or Radical to stand the least chance of success, if he were in favour of Maynooth. (Cheers.) I found, on canvassing the Whigs within the range of my own personal knowledge, that there was not either Whig or Radical who was not willing to sign a requisition to Mr. Frewen. There was not a Whig or Radical who would have voted for any Whig or Radical who would support the Grant to Maynooth. Some of the Whigs, who were the most distinguished for their influence and activity on former occasions, most willingly signed the requisition to Mr. Frewen ; and declared, that no consideration should induce them to vote for any member of their own party, who was in favour of the Grant to Maynooth. As far as Churchmen and Dissenters were concerned, there was no difference of opinion upon the subject. The question was not one of Party, but of Principle. It was not a question of Politics ;—

it was a question of Protestantism. (Hear, hear.) But we have been told in the House of Commons, that we have been keeping strange company ; and our Representatives have been referred to the *omnium gatherum* herd with which Conservatives were associated. Sir, it is perfectly possible for men of the world to be misled with respect to a discordant principle. But, if there is division in the camp, it is a division of the tribes of God in the camp. It is not a division of Gibeon and Amalek ; not a division of Moab and the children of Ammon ; but of the church of God. We might point, Sir, to the motley and many-coloured assemblage, by which we are confronted in this instance. We might point to the men of no faith and of false faith, combined together against the men of true faith. We might point to the confederacy, the most anomalous and discordant, perhaps, that ever addressed itself to a question of principle under these circumstances. We have, Sir, our Representatives of Popery proper—we have our Protestant Representatives of Popery—we have our Whigs, and we have our Conservatives, like Samson's foxes, tied tail to tail. (Cheers and laughter.) But their tails bring a common fire-brand. (Hear, hear.) I, Sir, for one, consider it a great honour, to be associated with my Christian brethren, of whatever name or Denomination. Dissenters and Churchmen, to the extent of their Christianity, are subjects of the same faith. They are washed from their sins in the blood of the same Lamb ; they are sanctified by the same Spirit ; they take their station in the train of that Conqueror, who has gone forth conquering and to conquer in this world ; and, when disembodied spirits pass the barriers of the visible world, they will be found united in the same Hallelujahs ; and,—after the millstone plunge, which is to announce the fall of Babylon through the hosts of the celestial world,—they will unite in the same Hallelujahs, to Him who sits upon the throne,—who has brought about the judgment of the great harlot. (Cheers.) Sir, I feel I should be trespassing on your attention, if I were to detain you any longer. I believe the movement may be hailed—not merely as an omen, that our national Protestantism is not dead, but only sleepeth ; but I believe it will effect for us more on behalf of Protestantism than the mere abstraction of a Grant to the College of Maynooth. We have been slumbering at our posts, while the Statesmen and Government of this Nation have been acting with inconsistency,—grosser, if possible, than that which they are about to exhibit at the present moment ;—we have been slumbering, while step after step was taken, to identify the State with that repudiated apostacy ; while bishop after bishop in that Church was receiving our money,—while priest after priest has received salaries from the coffers of the State,—while chapel after chapel was rising up,—while procession after procession of our Protestant governors, officers, and soldiers, were doing the “kouton” to the abomination that maketh desolate ; and, if this is not identifying ourselves nationally with Popery, I am at a loss to understand what is. (Hear.) We have been doing homage to it, just as decidedly as in any Grant, be it £26,000 or £100,000, to Maynooth, could have effected it. Now, I trust, that we have awakened to the discovery of our true position, we shall not rest satisfied with opposing the Grant to Maynooth, but that we shall insist upon a severance ; that we shall not cease to meet ; that we shall not cease to remonstrate, that we shall not cease to agitate, until we are cut



adrift from the fated vessel, to which Popery and the Liberalism of our Legislature have lashed us. (Great cheering.)

The CHAIRMAN.—The Resolution will be supported by John Pemberton Plumptre, Esq., M.P. (Loud cheers.)

J. P. PLUMPTRE, Esq., M.P.—My Christian friends, whatever reflection may be cast upon me “in another place”—(cheers and laughter)—for appearing amongst you on the present occasion, I can assure you it is a very high honour, and a very great happiness, to be permitted to take a humble part in this great and all-important business, that brings you together on this occasion. (Cheers.) I have separated myself from that assembly “in another place” for a little season; and I am afraid my duty must soon take me back thither: but still, I am happy to have the opportunity of telling you—however feebly, yet warmly, and honestly, and fervently—that my heart and soul are with you—(cheers)—in this great undertaking. My Christian friends—and that is the happy term by which I address you—we are all one in this matter. There are times, and there are places, which may be convenient and proper for discussing points on which we may legitimately differ; but this, as it seems to me, is not the time—when our common heart is assaulted. No, my friends, we ought at all times to stand together as one man, if we prize our Civil and Religious Liberty; if we prize, in fact, the Truth that binds us together—if we love the common Saviour, who has so loved us as to give Himself for us. It is a blessed spectacle that I have before me. Mixed up, as I am wont to be, with an assembly composed of such materials as my friend, who has just sat down, alluded to—a very motley crew—(laughter)—I say it is a happy thing for me, to find myself breathing another atmosphere—(cheers)—and I congratulate myself, as having the opportunity of declaring, that,—as I have endeavoured, in times past, to advocate the cause which brings us together,—feebly, and, I fear, inefficiently,—yet I have endeavoured to do it honestly; and, God being my helper, I will endeavour to do it still. (Cheers.) What the result of this great struggle may be, I mean the immediate result, it may be difficult for us to conjecture. What the final result will be, we can entertain no doubt. It is for Truth that we are contending; (cheers) and Truth is powerful, and will prevail. But, my dear friends, you may depend upon it, that our vessel is, at present, launched upon a stormy sea. It is a blessed privilege to know and to remember, Who is at the helm. That, I can assure you, is my strong consolation. That is my refuge, when other refuges seem to fail. When I look around me, and see the clouds dark and threatening here and there, I can take comfort in that blessed portion of Scripture, which I know you have been in the habit of reading when you have met together,—“God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.” (Cheers.) And now, my Christian friends, I cannot but encourage you to persevere in the course in which you are embarked. And why do I say that? Is it, that I would encourage you to any measures that cannot lawfully be taken by Christian men? God forbid! It is the course, not only prescribed to us by the highest authority, but it is *the constitutional course* that we have to take. You have to make your wants, your grievances known, in a legitimate way, to the legitimate sources of redress. (Hear, hear.) You have, in fact, nothing to do,

but humbly, honestly, firmly, decidedly, *prayerfully*, to use all the legitimate means that are left within your reach ; and, having done all, you must, and you will, thankfully and contentedly, leave the result with God. (Cheers.) I know what the *ultimate* result will be. Girding yourselves for the conflict, you will go on your way, resolved, in the strength of the Lord, earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints. You know, I believe, pretty well, what the result of the petitions already presented to the House of Commons has been. I believe we are going on now pretty rapidly towards 900,000 signatures to your Petitions. We shall have a million ere long; (cheers,) and you may depend upon this, that, although contempt may appear to be cast upon these Petitions, they are carrying with them their weight. Therefore I say to you, "Continue your Petitions: they must have their influence." I can judge from what I see around me, in the place to which I have alluded, that they have their weight. I believe too, there may be some of the Members of the House who are wavering and undecided. (Hear, hear.) Let your voice be still heard among such men. (Cheers.) At all events, my friends, you are but doing your duty: you are but taking the course that is prescribed to you: you are going on, in the only legitimate, constitutional way, to obtain your ends. There may be ulterior objects for you, when this first conflict shall be over, which you may legitimately take up: but you must persevere in this course; and I tell you, from what I see and hear about me, that these Petitions,—however they may appear to be despised,—are telling upon the minds of men. (Cheers.) My Christian friends, I did not expect to have the opportunity of addressing you here. I have stolen away from "another place." I must return thither. I am happy and thankful to have been among you. I thank you for the kind countenance you have given me. (Loud cheers.) I trust you will remember the sort of place, in which I, and others thinking and feeling with me, have to endeavour to advocate your cause. I trust you will remember us before the Source and Fountain of all wisdom and all justice. (Cheers.) I trust you will endeavour to bear up our hands and encourage our hearts: and, in this confidence, we shall still go forward, endeavouring to do what in us lies, to avert the tremendous evil which is now threatening our Country; and to promote that, which you are all desirous of—the maintenance and support of the great Truths of the Gospel. (Loud cheers.)

The Resolution was then put, and carried unanimously.

An individual here proposed *three cheers for Sir Robert Peel*.

The CHAIRMAN.—The individual who has interrupted the Meeting, whether a Protestant or a Roman Catholic in disguise, may take it for granted, that it is not at a Meeting like this, that three cheers will be given for Sir Robert Peel. (Loud and repeated cheers.) I have now the pleasure of introducing to the Meeting, the Rev. Thomas Guthrie, a Minister of the Free Church of Scotland, one of the Deputation from Edinburgh. (Loud cheers.)

The Rev. THOMAS GUTHRIE.—Sir Culling and Gentlemen, the motion that I have been requested to make is in the following terms:—

"That, whilst earnestly deprecating the Measure proposed by Her Majesty's

Government, and all Measures founded on similar principles, or having the like bearing, this Meeting strongly disclaims all feelings of hostility to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, and expresses its deep and lively interest in all that relates to the religious and temporal welfare of that important portion of our Country; and that an Address to the people of Ireland, founded on this Resolution, be forthwith prepared by the Committee now sitting in London, and circulated at their discretion."

I hope this Meeting will bear with me for a very little time. I shall endeavour to make myself heard over this large and catholic and Christian assembly,—although, I confess, my strength is little equal to such exertion; and, unless I had been intruded on the Meeting by my friends, I should not have been here this evening. For these two nights past, I have hardly closed my eyes. I came up to preach for those who, with other Episcopalians and Congregationalists, stood by us, when,—to use a Scotch expression, which I am sure will be understood by English hearts, if it is not common here—when my Church's back was at the wall. I came up out of gratitude and love and affection to the Wesleyan Methodists. I came up to do my little service in their great cause. I was under the necessity of travelling the whole night long, in consequence of having to attend a Meeting in Edinburgh, in honour of Mr. Dunlop,—in one sense, the rejected candidate for Greenock; but, in another sense, one who has gained a glorious and triumphant victory. (Cheers.) I should not have made this apology, but that I am ashamed of appearing before the Meeting, unprepared to address such an assembly in so good a cause. I feel that I am quite unprepared; but, having been requested to do so; and having read, in the *Times* of this morning, that no Minister of the Free Church of Scotland did, on the previous night, present himself to the assembly, I am called upon to say, in truth and honesty, that Ministers and members—men, women, and children,—old and young, young men and maidens, are all of one mind on this great question. (Cheers.) I came forward, with all those feelings with which your honourable Chairman wished me and my brethren to be animated, when he addressed them, three years ago, in the City of Edinburgh. Your honourable and honoured Chairman was then looking forward to coming events. There were then signs of disruption in the sky; the clouds were making up; the muttering of the distant thunder was heard; and your Chairman, with a prophetic eye, predicted that the disruption would come; "and when it does come," said Sir Culling Smith, in his address three years ago, "I pray you, Mr. Guthrie, don't go out, covered with points and crotchets, that will keep you separate from your Evangelical brethren." (Hear, hear.) And I rejoice to say, that I now come forward, animated with all the feelings which your honoured Chairman wished me to entertain. I thank Sir Robert Peel for the measure which he has brought forward. The very heat of it will melt all Christians together. (Loud cheers.) The necessity of union will compel them to act together; and they must not allow themselves to be broken up into parties. The cry has gone forth,—“Fall into square to receive cavalry”—and into square we must fall. (Cheers.) I rejoice that I have had the opportunity of hearing the sentiments of the Hon. Member for Kent, (Mr. Plumptre,) and I think the Meeting is bound to express its high sense of the noble, courageous, and Christian stand, which he has made, along with Mr. Fox Maule and

Mr. Patrick Maxwell Stewart. (Loud cheers.) It is a very easy thing for Capt. Gordon, or Mr. Plumptre, to come to a Meeting like the present ; and, when a noble sentiment is uttered, to behold the waving of a forest of black hats as a testimony of public admiration. (Hear, hear.) But it is a different thing to stand up in "another place,"—(laughter,)—and to bear up against the sneers, and sarcasms, and insinuations of men against the standard of Protestant Truth,—which a Christian Legislature ought to be ashamed to allow. These Gentlemen, however, have one comfort—they were in a minority in the *House of Commons* : but they are not in a minority of the Commons. (Loud cheers.) That has been asserted, and cannot be denied. It is true, there have been some Petitions in favour of the measure ; but they are Petitions from the Socinians in favour of the Papists—(cheers and laughter,)—who, whatever defects they may labour under, do not labour under the want of gratitude. That is quite plain. (Laughter.) I am no politician,—I never attended a political Meeting,—and should not have been present on this occasion, if this had been a political Meeting :—I never gave a political vote,—and never ate a political dinner. (Laughter.) But I take leave to say, I have read the history of my Country, and I know something of the British Constitution. Perhaps Members of Parliament may be better judges of beef, and bacon, and wool, and tariffs than the peasantry of my native land ; but I can take upon myself to assert, that the Scotch peasantry are better versed in the Shorter Catechism and the Bible, than all the Members of Parliament in England. (Cheers.) Although I am no politician, I understand this, that, under our free Constitution, in a matter touching men's consciences, there ought to have been a Dissolution of the Parliament :—(cheers,)—and the sooner the Country goes to the Throne, and addresses her Majesty, praying her to dissolve the Parliament,—(loud cheers,)—the sooner that is done, the better will it be,—not only for the Country, but for the Throne itself. (Continued cheering.) Something has been said of Exeter Hall braying ;—(laughter,)—and doubtless, there are a great many asses present to-night. (Continued laughter.) And I would venture to say, that, when the Dissolution comes, Mr. Macaulay will think the whole Country a country of asses, for they will all be braying together. (Roars of laughter.) It is high time the Country had another Parliament. (Cheers.) I never heard of such a Parliament since the days of one, whom a gentleman in the House of Commons called the Dutch Stadtholder. ; (Laughter.) What have they done ? They have riven the Church of Scotland in twain.\* They have made me a Dissenter. (Rapturous cheers.) I care nothing about that. They have

---

\* It was, perhaps, very natural for the speaker to be led away by his feelings on the Free Church question : but it was felt by many, that it would have been far more consonant to the object of the Meeting, had he been more cautious in touching upon this question,—and upon some others, on which wide differences of opinion existed among those present. Some parts of this speech, which called forth tokens of applause from some, were painful to others, who took different views. The speaker apologized for being unprepared ; and therefore no one would judge him severely : but more care to avoid topics, on which difference of judgment and feeling existed, would certainly have been desirable.—EDITOR.

split my country into two opposite factions. I feel bound to speak humbly of myself; but I will venture to say, they have cast out the best and holiest men in Scotland. (Loud cheers.) And, as if that were not enough,—as if it were not enough to cast out of that Church Evangelism,—the very salt which preserved her from corruption, what was the next thing they did? Why, after stripping us of our Endowments—which is a matter of very great indifference to me, for I will never touch a penny of their money again—(Loud cheers, which drowned the remainder of the sentence.) I am very much like the lady who was under the treatment of Dr. Jephson, at Leamington. She fancied she could not walk, and required her staves, and went hobbling along the road, in the full belief, that she had not the power of walking. The doctor wheedled her into her carriage one day, and drove her four or five miles out of town, and then assisted her out, to see some of the beauties of nature. As soon as she was out of the carriage, and the doctor in again, away went the carriage; and the lady, to her utter astonishment, found that she could walk home without her staves.—(Loud laughter.) Now I am not prepared to trust to the Government staves any more. (Loud cheers.) There are two classes of men calling themselves Christians, and, so far as I know, there are but two, with whom I and my Christian brethren will not hold communion. They are not the Methodists, nor the Congregationalists, nor the Baptists, nor the Episcopalians. I say, with Robert Hall, “I hold communion with all men Christ will hold communion with;—I hold that there should be no term of communion that is not a term of salvation.” (Cheers.) That is my doctrine. But there are two classes of men of a different description:—one of them a class which sink Divinity into humanity—I mean the Socinians—(hear, hear)—and the other a class, which do quite the reverse, which raise humanity into Divinity—worshipping Mary as the Mother of God. (Loud cheers.) At the bidding of Sir Robert Peel, who is the father of the disruption in the Church of Scotland, whatever merit there may be in that,—who is the father of the Socinian Bill, whatever merit there may be in that,—and who is the father of this Roman Catholic measure, whatever merit there may be in that,—at the bidding of the Prime Minister of this Country, the Parliament of Great Britain, after casting off Evangelism in the Church of Scotland, now take under the Government protection, and into the Government pay, on the one hand, those who deny our Lord’s Divinity, and on the other, those who raise humanity to a level with Divinity. (Loud cheers.) I think it high time to put an end to the present Parliament; and I must say, that I never before spoke anything so nearly approaching to politics. (Laughter.) I have (to use an expression of Lord Brougham’s) embraced them, but I have not touched them. (Continued laughter.) These are matters more for the consideration of laymen; and I will keep myself apart from such topics. I cannot, however, help reminding the Meeting of the time, when the Country was almost shaken in its centre, in the attempt to abolish a self-elected Parliament; and I will leave the Country to judge whether a self-representative Parliament is better than a self-elected one. (Loud cheers.) I trust that all really evangelical Christians will throw aside their little differences, and combine together, and sacrifice something more than their prejudices in so good a cause. (Cheers.) I wish Sir Robert Peel to see,

that the points of difference which exist only render our union more formidable. (Cheers.) I am afraid, that sufficient importance is not attached to this great principle—that men in office should be men of religious character and religious lives. The Country is now suffering, from not having in Parliament men of religious character and worth. (Hear, hear.) I trust your worthy Chairman will be returned at the first Election; (loud and long-continued cheering;) and that he will be supported by many others, who will apply a remedy to the present evil position of affairs. (Cheers.) I call upon every one present to sacrifice everything but conscience. I believe that every Free Churchman in Scotland, rather than see Popery endowed, would root up every Establishment. (Vehement cheers.) I do not pretend to see into the dark future, but I believe that it must come to that very soon. (Loud cheers.) At this moment, the vessel of Christ's Church is in the darkness and in the tempest,—driving either upon the coast of France, where all are endowed, or upon the coast of America, where none are endowed; and I must say, the coast of America for me. (Cheers.) I am satisfied that is the case; and, between the two, I will venture to say, that every Free Church Minister, and every Free Church man, if compelled to choose, would say, "America rather than France." (Great cheering.) I wish all parties to unite, and I will state my reason for wishing them to do so. If any one will read the history of the fall of Jerusalem, he will find, that the Jews were differing with each other when the Romans were at the gate. The Romans are now at the gate; and the different bodies of Christians must now be united. (Loud cheers.) Whilst I am opposed to the Endowment of Popery, so far from feeling any hatred to the Roman Catholics, I must say, that, when in Ireland, I received the greatest kindness from the Roman Catholics. (Hear, hear.) I was, for seven years, the Minister of a parish in Edinburgh, where there were many Irish Roman Catholics; and, during that time, I never experienced anything but kindness at their hands; and I trust that this Meeting, while opposing the Endowment of Maynooth, will sanction every measure calculated to redress the wrongs of Ireland, (loud cheers,) and not leave the cry of "Justice to Ireland!" to be raised merely by Irishmen. (Cheers.) So far from entertaining any hatred to the Roman Catholic priests, I admire and honour them; and for this reason, they have acted according to their own conscience, ill informed as it has been,—they have never abandoned their Religion, and they have never abandoned their people. (Cheers.) I will do justice to every man. There is no man who hates Popery more than myself; but I will say this, that it would be well if Protestant Ministers would imitate the Catholic priest. The Irish priest has stood by the Irish peasant\* in his hour of poverty, in his fevered bed, and in his hour of death;

---

\* Some of those who know Ireland well, and the conduct of the Irish priests, would have given a very different view of the conduct of those priests towards the peasants. Romish priests, indeed, are very diligent in administering "the rites of the Church;" and they are careful to maintain their own influence over the people, by any means. But whether they really *stand by* the peasants, in their hours of sickness and distress, is quite another question. See a book entitled, "Ireland: its Evils traced to their Source. By the Rev. James R. Page, (formerly of the Diocese of Tuam.)" London, 1836; and the remarks of the Rev. S. A. Walker, in p. 149.—ED.

and such men deserve the greatest honour for the care and anxiety they have evinced. (Cheers.) But I cannot give money to educate the Irish priest in Popery, because I love him too well. (Cheers.) I love his soul too well. (Cheers.) I love him too well, to educate him in what is not God's Truth. (Cheers.) This is my feeling; this is my reason; and I put it to this Meeting, whether it would not be mockery in a Christian Minister, to pray for the conversion of a Papist, and yet pay money to keep him a Papist still? (Cheers.) Let justice be done to that Country, my Christian friends. I would pay money, over and over again, to do justice to Ireland, for any secular object. In that respect, this Country has a great debt to pay; but to endow Popery would be a miserable way of discharging that debt. (Cheers.) Let British money drain Ireland's bogs—let British skill construct Ireland's harbours—let British mercy hover over Ireland's gaols—let British freedom strike off Ireland's chains,—but, above all, let British Christians flood Ireland with Bibles. (Loud and long-continued cheering.)

The CHAIRMAN.—Gentlemen, this Resolution will be seconded by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist W. Noel (Enthusiastic cheers.)

The Hon. and Rev. BAPTIST W. NOEL.—Permit me, Sir, to call your attention for a moment to the terms of the Resolution, which has been proposed to the Meeting. (The Rev. Gentleman then read the Resolution, as already given in page 190.) Sir, it is a remarkable spectacle that is now presented to our view. While the Parliament of Great Britain is sitting in the very neighbourhood of this Hall, this important Meeting has been called, to criticise certain measures which have been proposed to one of the Houses of Parliament, and sustained and carried by a very large Majority. That large Majority contains within it, a very large proportion of those, who have been prominent in both the great Parties into which that House is divided; and Statesmen of great name, and to whom many—perhaps all—in this assembly, have been accustomed to assign various degrees of confidence, are found remarkably banded together, in opposition to that feeling which has called us together. Is it arrogant in us, or not, to assemble thus, in the face of such preponderating talent,—to which all of us, no doubt, are ready to yield the meed of our willing homage? Now, Sir, there is a peculiarity connected with that Debate, which occurred on the Second Reading of the Bill we have to discuss, which may well justify our meeting on this occasion, and our continuing to prosecute that agitation (if you please to call it so) by which we have been assembled this evening. (Hear, hear.) No one can have read the speeches in that Debate, with any attention, without having been struck by this peculiarity, that there was a sensitive and a determined omission of all reference to Religious arguments, upon which this Bill is either to be supported or rejected. Many other arguments were used by the advocates of the Measure, having various degrees of plausibility, or even force: but one and all, as far as I recollect of that Debate, concurred in deprecating the introduction of Religious arguments into that House. One declared, that our Protestantism was so undefined, that it afforded no satisfactory principle on which we could legislate in this matter; as though we claimed, at this present moment, any Endowment of a doctrine which that Gentleman could term indefinite. Another would state, that we were speaking as though we were infallible; and that we supposed ourselves

infallibly to possess the Truth. We must observe, that we do not demand an agreement with our opinions in others : but we are at liberty to profess our own. And what we complain of is,—not that others express *their* opinion, but that they should violate our consciences, by making *us* parties to an act which *we* must condemn. (Hear, hear.) It may do very well, where such vague expressions on Religion pass unnoticed, to condemn us as arrogating to ourselves infallibility : but I would ask the Hon. Member who used such expressions, whether there are not certain cases, in which he himself might likewise plead guilty to the same charge? If there were a number of Russians in this Country, who should declare, that, in their opinion, our Constitution was far inferior to the despotism under which they live—that Trial by Jury was a curse—that a Press unlicensed by the public censor was a mischief—that a Representative Government was a nuisance to be abated—would that Hon. Member declare, “ Each man must have his own opinion; and there is no certainty, in fact, that a Constitutional Monarchy is better than a Despotism?” (Hear, hear.) But if he would allow, on this and other questions, that there are ascertained truths,—then I venture to say, that we are as much entitled, by the result of a thousand discussions, to claim for ourselves certainty, in our assertion, that Protestantism is truer and better than Romanism, as in the assertion, that a Constitutional Monarchy is better than Russian Despotism. (Cheers.) And some have affected to deplore the bigotry, which would charge the belief of the Roman Catholic doctrines on any one as an awful delusion; and others tell us, that we must treat their errors with leniency. In fact, nearly the whole of that Debate, the tenor of that Debate, with respect to both Parties who advocated the Measure, might perhaps be summed up in these words, which one noble Lord used to the delight of that assembly. This seemed to be the tone and feeling of almost every one of its advocates—perhaps all—

“ Speak gently of our sister’s fall;  
Who knows but gentle love  
May win her, at our patient call,  
The surer way to prove?”

Did that noble Lord believe, that a Church, which claims for itself infallibility, would be won by his syren voice, (laughter and cheers,) to proclaim, that it had been for ages under a delusion? Or did the noble Lord rather mean to say, that the “ surer way” which it would “ prove” to victory over Protestantism, was to invade our camps—to insinuate itself into our Churches, and eventually to recover an ascendancy in this land? (Hear, hear.) If that was the noble Lord’s meaning, it might, perhaps, be nearer to the truth. But he further says—and the *Times*’ report of his speech, declares that the attention of the House followed that statement—

“ The priests, those gentle priests and good, their fathers loved to hear;  
Sole type below, midst work and woe, of the Lord whom they revere.”

The priests of Ireland, a Protestant tells us, are the “ sole type” of the Lord whom I revere! (Hear, hear.) “ Those gentle priests”! Where did he learn in history, that priestcraft is “ gentle”? Did he learn its “ gentle-



ness" in the Inquisition of Spain? (Cheers.) Its "gentleness" in the massacre of St. Bartholomew in France? (Hear, hear.) Its "gentleness" in the priesthood of Italy? (Hear, hear.) Its "gentleness" in the manner they have dealt with one of our Christian brethren in Madeira? (Hear, hear.) But the fact, that these sentiments were applauded by that House, sufficiently shows to us, that if the objections we entertain to the Measure are of a Religious kind,—as they have been overlooked *there*, they must be discussed *here*. (Cheers.) Yet if this was the *negatively*-described tone of that Debate, there was likewise a *positive* character about it, to which I, for one, should be disposed to attach much more respect. You will have observed, in all these speeches, on both sides of the House, there was one governing principle which animated every vote. It was this, that, in the present excited state of Ireland, it was absolutely necessary that she should be contented and pacified. Some would be disposed to yield it peace, out of the fear they have of its agitation; and some, as a measure of justice, independent of any pressure from without; but all concurred in this, that it was necessary to pacify Ireland. (Hear, hear.) Now, Sir, for one, I am ready to go the full length with all those Hon. Members. I am ready to say, not merely that Ireland should be pacified; but that Ireland should be contented: that the Roman Catholics of Ireland should be won into peace and brotherhood. (Hear, hear.) I do not mean, by any conversion from their faith; but—before that conversion takes place, and as preliminary to it. I, for one, feel the full force of this argument, whether used by her Majesty's Government, or by those who are usually opposed to them; and it seems to me, Sir, that it is our bounden duty to concur with all these public men, in the endeavour to make Ireland contented with the Constitution under which it lives, and to make it glory in the Empire of which it forms a part. (Cheers.) It does not become reasonable men, as it seems to me, to look with apathy on six millions of our fellow-subjects discontented and unhappy: and, if there be any reasonable method, by which these six millions of Roman Catholics can be contented and made happy, it is our bounden duty to secure to them that contentment. But, although I say it is our duty to secure to them this contentment,—because it is always wise, in every struggle, were there no other object, that we should take care that justice is on our side: yet I venture to predict, that the pacification and contentment of Ireland must not take place through the Endowment of its Church, or of its priests. (Cheers.) It is not by such means, that the advantage, however great, is to be won. Let me here say, once for all, that I will pass altogether from the consideration of the Grant, to the consideration of the Establishment of the Romish Church; because it is plain to every considerate person, that the principle of the one is identical with the principle of the other. Some Hon. Members have ventured to speak of this merely as an educational question: but let me observe, that all the leading Members, on both sides, have been obliged to confess, or have willingly avowed, that this is not the fact—Lord John Russell, Mr. Macaulay, Sir George Grey, and those who take the same line of argument, have all declared, that they supported the present Measure, because it contained a recognition of the doctrines of the Roman Catholics, and must eventually lead to the Establishment of their Church. The *Journal des Débats* has advanced

the same doctrine, with a force of reasoning it would not be easy to resist ; and Mr. Gladstone acknowledged, that all religious objection to the Establishment of the Roman Catholic Church would be done away with in the House of Commons, if this Measure were passed. Sir James Graham avowed, that this Measure alone would never pacify Ireland ; but that it was the beginning of a series of Measures that would do so. Sir Robert Peel was pressed with the question, whether he would venture to say, that there was any insuperable objection to the Establishment of that Church ? He cautiously and guardedly declared, that he would make no such statement, which might embarrass his successors in Office. It is, therefore, quite plain, that there is the principle of Endowment of the Romish priesthood, in this Grant for the Endowment of a Romish College. However some Gentlemen may be willing to lead the mind of the public away from this main ultimate question, it will be my effort to fix the mind of the public upon it ; and to remember that this, and nothing but this, is the question we have to discuss, and the object we have to repel. (Cheers.) Now, the Establishment of the Roman Catholic Church appears to me, not to be the proper method of pacifying Ireland—simply, because it is contradictory to all Evangelical Truth. It is a contempt of Evangelical Truth. It is in opposition to our principles as Protestants. If any persons deny this, I would venture to ask them, whether the Endowment of any other doctrine, would not seem to them a sanction of that doctrine ? If it were proposed, for example, by the House of Commons to-morrow, (and we could imagine *this* Debate obliterated from the minds of Hon. Members)—I ask, whether you do not believe, that, if a proposition for the Endowment of the Wesleyan Methodists were to be argued within the House of Commons, the argument adduced would not be, that they could not consent to sanction, by Endowment from the Country, any other doctrine than that of the Established Church ? Now, if that would be the argument, on precisely an analogous question, it must be the character of the vote to which they have now come. No man of common sense will be hindered from perceiving, that it is a sanction of the doctrine itself which is now sought ; and which must take place, if the Roman Catholic Church be endowed. But that sanction, it seems to us, as Protestants, utterly impossible that we should give. If the House of Commons shall determine, that they are not competent to examine Theological questions, then why should they pass judgment upon questions that involve Theology ? (Hear, hear.) Fully aware, Gentlemen, as I am of the difficulty which Her Majesty's Government may feel, in governing this great Empire : and fully aware as I am, of the difficulty which Ireland throws in their way,—still I, for one, am ready to confess, that I would not purchase, at this price, any conceivable advantage which the Empire might obtain. (Cheers.) If peace is a great and a necessary blessing—if it is an object which every patriot should labour for, and every Christian seek in prayer—yet it is not a blessing that is to be purchased by the sacrifice of something better and richer still—I mean by the sacrifice of Truth. Truth is the world's inheritance, the world's riches. We should grapple the Truth to our hearts : we should seek it everywhere ; purchase it at all costs ; and never part with it. Divine Truth is destined to bless mankind. Destined, did I say ? It has done it already. Divine Truth has won for us our temporal, as well as our spiritual blessings. What was it

that disenthralled the mind of Europe but the Truth, as advocated by Luther and his brethren? (Cheers.) When was it that the mind of England first took its giant spring, and leaped forth in every direction?—leaped forth to the acquisition of Science, and the multiplication and improvement of the Arts, and laid the foundation of our Liberties too? Every one knows, that that era is identified with the Reformation in this Country. (Cheers.) And since that day, every student of History knows well, how closely all the best civil privileges that we value, the rights, which we know how to maintain, have been identified with the Truths of the Gospel. Hampden was an earnest Christian, a devout and holy man, who was nerved for his high enterprise, and could endure his sufferings, because he knew the Truth as it is in Christ, and clung to it with a living faith. (Cheers.) And, since him, have others, equally distinguished for their love of civil liberty, been likewise distinguished for their adherence to Evangelical Truth. In this Country, therefore, at least, that Evangelical Truth, which the House of Commons—or, at least, some of its Members, appear to despise, is the foundation of our best blessings, Civil, as well as Religious. (Loud cheers.) While teaching us how to reach immortal glory, it secures ten thousand blessings around us *here*, and makes our minds active, gives vigour to our character, blesses our homes, and makes us glory in the Land in which we dwell. And, therefore, if they are prepared to sacrifice this Evangelical Truth, *we* are not. (Loud cheers.) As long as the Constitution of this Country gives us a legitimate mode of expressing our opinions, with a view to influence the Legislature, so long,—though they may think it is an evanescent fervour,—they may be assured, we shall feel it our bounden duty to contend for Truth; and this we will do, so long as God gives us intellect and breath. (Loud cheers.) I am, therefore, not prepared to surrender the supremacy of Divine Truth for any advantages. Nay, though the evils, which they sometimes predict, were as real as I believe them to be chimerical;—were as near as I believe they are distant—still, I cannot hesitate to assert, that if this Country were exposed to the most violent combination of Foreign foes—if the United States were combined with France, to attack our shores; and Ireland, diseased and wretched, were ready to make common cause,—as I do not believe she would (loud cheers)—I would rather meet the horrors of Revolution, or yield to the overwhelming force of Foreign foes—personally, if I know myself, I would rather meet the bands of the enemy, and let them march over my dead body. (Reiterated cheers.) I rejoice, my dear friends, in that expression of your loyalty to the Truth. (Renewed cheers.) It may seem, to some, that it is but an idle bravado, since we are not exposed to dangers like these. I do not utter it, as though it implied much gallantry; but I utter it as the expression of that, which, I believe, is the deep-wrought and lasting feeling, not of myself alone, but of the very great majority of the people of this Country. (Cheers.) If, then, the pacification of Ireland depended upon the sacrifice of Truth, we must submit to the mournful necessity of permitting incurable division to remain. But this Measure, which is proposed, is utterly inadequate to effect that object. (Cheers.) If we sacrificed Truth, we should sacrifice it in vain:—we should not advance one step towards the object, which *we* have at heart as much as *they* have. Now, this Grant itself,—how can it be supposed to pacify them, if it be viewed

as a restitution? It was said, by one Hon. Member, to be a restitution of six-pence in the pound. (Laughter.) And, while one noble Lord justified his vote on this single ground, another Right Hon. Gentleman, who supported it, repudiated the thought with scorn. How should it pacify Ireland? Will it give them the equality they seek?—a miserable addition of £17,000 a-year, for the education of their priesthood! Will the Grant that is thus proposed, put them on the same level with their Protestant fellow-subjects? for that is what they seek at our hands. If not, it is only adding fuel to the flame. (Cheers.) The success of past agitation is beckoning them forward to fresh encounters—is telling them to marshal their forces once more, and that a little more agitation will win another victory. That which is conceded simply from a sense of justice, might give a momentary pause to agitation. If conceded to a pressure from without, and to fear, it is adding fresh excitement to the flame it professes to allay. But if it leads, as lead it must, to one step after another, till the Establishment of the Romish priesthood be the crown of this measure,—even that will be far from pacifying Ireland: for let us remember this, that the boon which the Roman Catholics seek at our hands (and I am not prepared to say they ask it unreasonably)—is absolute equality.\* Let the Roman Catholics be paid by the State; and observe the discrepancy which will still exist between their position and that of the Established Clergy. The one will receive salaries by vote, year by year, which may be withdrawn at pleasure. The other have fixed and permanent Endowments. (Cheers.) The one are possessed of large and tempting revenues, while the others would have but small and moderate salaries attached to their offices. And Lord Beaumont has properly declared, that, in his belief, Ireland would never be satisfied, until the present Endowments of the Protestant Church are placed in their hands. At least, if that be not the alternative, it is a statement of a Roman Catholic author, of great authority, and much research, that they would never be satisfied, until they are brought to a perfect equality with their Protestant brethren. [Some interruption here took place, in consequence of an observation made by a young man in the body of the Meeting, and several persons exclaimed, “Turn him out.”] Let him alone. He can do no harm at all.

The CHAIRMAN.—The Meeting has been a good deal interrupted by a young person here, who, I do not think, is quite in his senses. (Hear, hear.) I must request him to be silent, or I shall be obliged to have him removed from the Meeting. (Cheers.)

---

\* Not a few would be inclined to ask, whether it should not rather have been said, “The boon which they *profess* to seek”? Do not the principles of the Romish Church lead it to seek for *uncontrollable Supremacy*? The famous Bull “*Unam Sanctam*” says, “Moreover, that every human creature be subject to the Roman Pope, we declare, define, and pronounce to be altogether necessary to salvation.” (See the Digest of Evidence on the State of Ireland, Part ii. p. 67.)

Those who understand *this, and nothing less than this*, to be the real principle of the Romish Church,—and the attainment of this *Supremacy* to be the real object of Romanists,—could not, of course, go along with Mr. Noel in an argument founded on the notion that the Romanists of Ireland would be *contented with equality*. And many of his brethren lamented, that he enlarged so much upon this subject—which (as they believed) tended to promote a delusion.—EDITOR.

Mr. NOEL resumed.—I was observing, Gentlemen, that the Measure which has been proposed for the adoption of the Parliament of Great Britain, and the Second Reading of which has passed by a considerable majority,—whilst it sacrifices Protestant Truth,—is not calculated to pacify Ireland; but is rather likely to lead to fresh efforts on the part of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to secure that which is the ultimate object of their desires—*equality with their Protestant fellow-subjects*. But I have still further complaint to make of this Bill, which is now being carried through Parliament. The objection I have to make to this Measure, viewed as a measure for the pacification of Ireland, is, that those who are its authors have begun pacification at the wrong end. It has been justly said—at least, it appears to me to have been said with justice—that one fault to be found with the Measure is, that it seems to be an apology for the bad Government of Ireland. If they may be cajoled into believing that *this* is sufficient for them, then the other evils that remain may be left untouched. But if, on the other hand, they obtained the Civil Equality which they seek, would not the Roman Catholics of Ireland be content? Let me imagine, that they have an equal taxation—that they are treated like ourselves in the encouragement of their industry;—that, like ourselves, they have the same elective franchise, and the same municipal franchise;—let me suppose, that, while they have, with us, the pure and equal administration of justice,—can I believe that, when hereby, along with a great Nation, they were put at the head of the Nations, and beyond all the Nations of Europe,—they would not feel, that this Empire was their glory, and the Constitution, under which they live, the source of their greatest blessings? Now, some may say, as long as they have not Religious equality, they will never be contented with that which is Civil. (Hear, hear.) I must say, I agree with my Reverend friend who preceded me on this occasion, in saying, that I, for one, am not prepared to blame them for seeking even that boon. It is natural for men to claim equality with those around them; and, while I should be glad that the Roman Catholics should be fully contented in all their great claims—in every claim that they themselves can (with an honest mind) pronounce to be just, respecting all their civil and secular advantages, I will say, with my Reverend friend who preceded me on this occasion, that, if it can be proved that the Establishment in Ireland is the grievance of which some of them speak—if it can be shown, that, instead of answering the purpose of a great National Establishment, it cripples the exertions of those estimable and excellent men who are found in it, then I, for one, believe that these men themselves—my brethren in Christ, who are members of that Establishment, and who are boldly and powerfully proclaiming its Truths,—rather than see Protestant Truth trampled under foot—rather than see the Endowment of a Creed they know to be false—rather than see falsehood and delusion raised to a level with themselves,—they would, with one voice, and with one consent, declare, that they will commit, as the Free Church of Scotland has done—(loud and continued cheering)—they will commit themselves to the cause of Truth, and—no longer shackled by the armour of King Saul—they will go forth, as David did, to meet the Philistines. (Cheers.) If, then, this Endowment is incapable of pacifying Ireland, and there are other measures which would pacify it,—every one, who has an honest heart, and a clear head, will decide, that our

Legislature are bound to take the course which is dictated by principle, high principle, rather than that which sacrifices principle to expediency. (Loud cheers.) And it seems to me, Sir Culling, that we are bound to continue in the course we have so auspiciously begun : for, although it may seem that the odds are greatly against us in this battle on which we have entered,—so much of talent, and such a majority of votes being marshalled against us,—yet—when I look at Kent and Lord Holmesdale on the one hand, and Greenock and Mr. Baine on the other—I see there is a feeling in the Country—which our Legislature may not think it wise to meet.—A single day before the Election at Greenock, Mr. Dunlop went down to oppose his friend and rival ; and, on this question, he was within five votes of carrying that large Constituency—a pledge of what will take place at the next Election, which is not far off. (Loud cheers.) These facts are enough to show us, that we should,—not at one Election, but Election after Election, until this great Protestant question is determined,—vote for those men who have fixed and firm opinions upon this subject,—in unison with our own. (Cheers.) It may not be wise to introduce Candidates solely on this ground ; because it may be found, that a Constituency, feeling warmly on the subject, may not be the majority on the occasion ; but, if you support those Candidates who entertain favourable opinions, you will, on many occasions, see, that even a comparatively small number of votes may be able to carry the day in a disputed Election. (Cheers.) But we have more to do than that. Above 6,000 Petitions have been presented already ; and, although they have been compared to waste paper, encumbering the table of the House of Commons,—yet we have heard this evening, they have still silently had their weight ; and we can see it in the Divisions that have already taken place. Let these thousands of petitions be still multiplied ; and then, as they grow in numbers, year by year, the decision of this great Country will not be doubtful,—that it is resolved, not to persecute Romanists—not to interfere with the liberty of the Roman Catholics—not to injure them in any secular matter whatsoever—but to support the Protestant principle, and not to share in the guilt of endowing and sanctioning doctrines which they consider unscriptural. (Cheers.) It appears to me, Gentlemen, that there is one thing more to be done. The Government have embraced the Measure, as the means of pacifying this great Empire ; and they would secure its quiet by that, which seems to us inconsistent with principle. Let us, from this day, take care, that the Protestantism of England and Scotland does not slumber. (Cheers.) Let us take care to organise, in every part of the Country, Associations that shall proclaim to this Country what Romanism is. (Cheers.) Let us argue it clearly,—although a noble and learned Lord, who has often done discredit to his superlative eloquence by an unjust and unreasonable contempt of others, calls it *furious nonsense*,—let us still, in every part of this Country, organise Associations, by which we may take care—with calmness, and with gravity, and with truth, and with moderation—to bring out from History all its charges against Romanism—to tell them what Romanism is in other lands—to unveil (for England does not know it) the Romanism of Ireland. Let us take care to show the workings of this Bill, year by year ;—let us see what class of persons it pours forth from Maynooth ;—let us bring, one after another

before the public, all the proofs, that it has been a political blunder, and has failed in its object. Let us observe the progress of those who are its authors; and observe how, step by step, they may be advancing to other concessions, in our opinion equally dangerous and unprincipled; and the result of this will be, if I mistake not, that those who have been its authors will see, that it has operated precisely contrary to what they intended; and that, instead of uniting this Empire, it must, by the force of circumstances, dis sever its different parts more and more. (Cheers.) Gentlemen, it may be said, that this is the fever of a momentary excitement; but, if I may judge of your feelings by my own, it is an excitement that has not risen without an examination of the facts. It is an excitement which we are able to justify in the face of any man. We should not fear to meet, face to face, with any man, in this Country, or in Europe, in defence of the course we are pursuing. (Cheers.) It is the conclusion at which we have arrived, after the best investigation in our power; with a consciousness, that we hate no man;—with a feeling that we are ready to grant to all their real rights;—with an earnest wish, as earnest as any member of Her Majesty's Government can feel, that this great Empire may be one. Then let us learn, that it is sometimes as noble to bear bad names as it is always noble to avoid bad things. Let us hate bigotry with all our hearts, and avoid every narrow-minded and exclusive notion that can be construed into bigotry. But if, in the maintenance of Truth, and the endeavour to establish all that is high and holy, we may be termed *bigots*,—then let us not feel even a momentary irritation, that would induce us to disown the name, or to revile, in return, those who may reproach us. (Cheers.) Were we disposed to do so, I should ask the Conservatives in the House of Commons, whether their only object is to conserve what seems debasing and vile? I would ask the Whigs in the House of Commons, who ought to be the patrons of truth, and of liberty, and of all that may ennoble man—I would ask them, whether they mean to be the patrons, henceforth, of the Confessional?—the patrons of a doctrine that teaches men to bow down to the Virgin Mary? (Hear, hear.) I would ask them, whether they mean, henceforth, to legislate in favour of a Religion which denies the laity the right, without the sanction of a priest, to read the Word of God? (Hear, hear.) Are they prepared to sacrifice all their own impressions, I know not for what purpose—I will not impute motives—but for some purpose, which it is hard for an honest man to discover,—or, if he can discover, to justify it:—I ask, whether they are prepared, in the face of all their professions, to coalesce with their antagonists on this occasion, in which the liberty of mankind,—in which our best privileges—in which our religious privileges would compel them to refuse their concurrence? (Cheers.) The Marquis of Lansdowne may say, this is a momentary excitement; and may tell us (as he has told us) that, as soon as this Bill has been carried, the fever will pass away, and we shall express our regret, that we ever entertained an opposite opinion. (“No, no.”) But, Gentlemen, if I may interpret your feelings by my own, they are these,—that, if it be necessary to reiterate these sentiments for twenty years, we will do it. (Loud cheers.) We will do it, till we see in Parliament an entire change of the tone which the Members have assumed. Our fathers attempted the first Reformation in this land, under disadvantages far greater than ours; and, when there is Truth on

our side, depend upon it, it is no chimerical enterprise in which we are engaged. When we see, that we may effect, on this point, a second Reformation; and when the tone of public men shall become the tone of this Meeting, *then* the Legislation of a Protestant Majority must be based upon Protestant principles. (Loud, and long-continued cheering.)

The Rev. GEORGE OSBORN, Wesleyan Minister, was received with loud applause. He said—I think myself happy, Sir Culling and Gentlemen, that I am called upon to support this Resolution; because I happen to belong, as you have already intimated to the Meeting, to a body of people who have been most bitterly accused of hostility to Ireland: because it has been said, that, whatever of bigotry and vehemence may have characterised the opposition of other parties to the Measure which is now before the House of Commons, the opposition of the Wesleyan Methodists deserves to be characterised as the most acrimonious bigotry. (Hear, hear.) I confess, I do not understand this accusation. I am very much at a loss to imagine, upon what principle it is grounded. I cannot imagine what there is, in the past conduct and history of that body of Christians, which should give rise to the supposition, that they are actuated by any more intense feeling of hostility to Ireland than any other portion of their fellow-Christians on this side the Channel; and for myself, and on behalf of that body, I believe I may, with the utmost confidence and sincerity, say,—that they are actuated by no sentiment of hostility to Ireland whatever. (Cheers.) And, Sir, if I did not heartily concur in this sentiment,—if this was not the full persuasion of my own mind,—and if I had not the best ground for believing, that this is the full persuasion of the minds of all the large Body of persons of whom I speak,—I would not take upon myself the responsibility of supporting the Resolution which is now before the Meeting. (Hear, hear.) Sir, in a name which has, according to the papers of this morning, been opprobriously attached to that body, I find a very sure pledge of the friendship which the Wesleyan Methodists entertain towards Ireland. The Bishop of one of the dioceses,—I forget which,—but the Right Rev. Dr. Higgins, whose letter appears in the *Times* this day, says, amongst the opposition, which this Measure has had to encounter from various sources in England, it has had to encounter the opposition of the “Swaddlers.” Sir, I happen to be one of that body, whom this gentleman contemptuously denominates “Swaddlers.” (A laugh.) I do not know, whether that word is English. I am not quite sure, whether the gentlemen around me and before me understand the meaning which is attached to that expression; but I happen to know, and I believe it is on record, that the name was first given to a Wesleyan Minister in the City of Cork,—who, happening to preach on the subject of the Incarnation, and making use of a text referring to that subject in the Gospel,—“ye shall find him wrapped in Swaddling Clothes, and lying in a manger,”—was himself contemptuously designated a “Swaddler.” It was this circumstance which caused the appellation to be attached to the followers of John Wesley; and from the year 1749, in which the same person preached this sermon in the city of Cork, down to this year 1845, the term “Swaddlers” has been the description of “the body of people called Methodists.” (Cheers and laughter.) Sir, on behalf of these same reviled people, I cordially, and from my heart, declare, that there is no measure that can be



devised by the Legislative wisdom of the Empire,—which shall have a real tendency to promote the welfare of Ireland, without infringing the conscientious convictions of the Protestants of England,—to which they, among the Protestants of England, will not give their hearty and most unanimous assent. (Cheers.) I know not what measures may be necessary for developing the resources of Ireland, and placing it in a prosperous condition ; but—if it be necessary for the Government to advance capital for the construction of railroads, advance it ;—if it be necessary to advance the capital of the Country for the purpose of widening her rivers and extending her canals,—advance it ; if it be necessary to make advances from the Consolidated Fund for promoting her manufactures,—advance it. (Hear, hear.) Whatever is calculated to promote the prosperity of that portion of the Empire, which does not infringe on the liberty of the consciences of the Protestants of England, let it be done, in the name of everything that is good. (Cheers.) I disclaim every feeling of hostility towards any of the inhabitants of Her Majesty's Empire,—whether in England or in Ireland, who profess the Roman Catholic religion. I wish to respect their consciences, as I would have my own respected. (Hear.) I wish them to be at liberty to propagate their own sentiments, as I would wish to be at liberty to propagate mine. I have no wish to impose restrictions on their use of the pulpit, the platform, or the press. I have no wish to impose restrictions on their erection of chapels, monasteries, nunneries, or any buildings which they may think necessary for the purposes of their Religion. I desire, that *they* should be able to propagate *their* views, with the same freedom with which *I* desire to be able to propagate my own. (Cheers.) But, Sir, I think there is a wide distinction between allowing these gentlemen the utmost freedom they can desire, and securing that freedom to them by every legal means that may be necessary,—and giving to them, out of the Consolidated Fund, and out of the purse of Protestant England, assistance towards the dissemination of their peculiar Religious tenets. (Loud cheers.) Sir, I say, out of the funds of Protestant England : and I hope no invidious considerations can be suggested by the use of this expression. I am no politician : but I think I have heard enough of what passes in “another place,” which has been referred to to-night, to understand, that, but for the Income-Tax, there would be a deficit in the Exchequer ; I think I have heard enough of what passes elsewhere to know, that, but for the Income-Tax, no means would exist for granting this £26,000 a-year for the College of Maynooth ; and I think I know enough of what has been said elsewhere, to be aware of the fact, that *the Income-Tax is not paid in Ireland*. (Hear, hear.) If it is the Income-Tax, (which does not exist in Ireland) which replenishes Her Majesty's Exchequer to such an extent, that the proposed Grant *can* really be paid out of the Consolidated Fund,—then I say, that Ireland is asking the English Protestants to pay this additional Grant. (Cheers.) Then, as an English Protestant, I have a right to say to Ireland at large, if it be necessary,—and especially to the gentlemen whose benefit is more particularly contemplated by the Grant in question,—“I decline to be taxed for the support of a Creed in which I do not believe !” (Loud cheers.) I say, “If you love your Creed,—(and you have a right to have it as your Creed ; so far as I am concerned—you have a right to believe in it ; and you have a right to love it

as heartily as I love mine)—do as I do,—(cheers)—support it yourselves.” (Continued cheers.) Sir, I cannot think that, by any stretch of language, that can be interpreted to mean persecution. (Cheers.) That is my answer to Mr. Sheil. (Cheers.) If you call that persecution, I am contented to be reputed a persecutor; but if you call that persecution, you must remodel every dictionary of the English language. (Cheers.) Sir, if it were not quite so late—(cries of “Go on,”)—I should have adverted to one or two other points, on which I think grievous injustice has been done, not so much to the Wesleyan Methodists, as to the Religious feelings of this Protestant Nation, taken as a whole. I take the liberty to think, as one of her Majesty’s subjects,—whether represented, unrepresented, or misrepresented—(cheers)—has nothing to do with the question,—(hear, hear, and a laugh)—I take liberty to think, as one of the Protestant people of this Empire, that a great injustice has been done us on this occasion; and that we have not had, in the Senate of the Nation, anything like a fair, full, and adequate Representation. (Cheers.) When I have looked at the Debates that have taken place, in reference to this subject, and the lists of the Divisions, I have been reminded of the remark of a certain clever man, that “language is a contrivance for concealing our thoughts;” and have been apt to say, “Surely, Parliament is a contrivance to enable a Minister to govern independently of the wishes of the people.” (Cheers.) Gentleman after Gentleman, representing large constituencies, has thought proper to say—“I know I am opposing those who have sent me here; but still I think proper to vote as I am about to vote;” and, Sir, in many instances, Gentleman after Gentleman—I will not say has dared public opinion—but, under the influence of what he has believed to be a conscientious discharge of duty—has put himself into direct collision with those who are called his constituents. I hope, Sir, that one of these Gentlemen in particular will find that Protestantism is a negative. (Hear, hear.) I have heard, from one of these Gentlemen, that Protestantism is nothing more than a negative. Now, if it were six o’clock instead of ten, I would endeavour to show him—(upon his own admission, that the Protestantism of the Church of England is something that he can abide by)—I would show him, that the Protestantism of the Church of England is a very negative Protestantism indeed—that is to say, that the Church of England does not consider her protest complete, without—after announcing the Truth—declaring at the same time, that she rejects Error, of which Truth is the contrary. (Cheers.) But I can only say, that I hope the Right Hon. Gentleman will find, there is Protestantism enough in Newark, to put a very decided negative upon his solicitation of the votes of the Electors. (Loud cheers.) I hope that Young England will be taught the difference between Young England and Old England. (Cheers.) I do not think, Sir,—and I am glad to find that the present assembly participate in these sentiments,—I do not think, that, in the sense of these Gentlemen, England has come of age yet—(laughter)—still less, that she is grown old; and I trust she will continue young—until she dies (if I may borrow the language of a Book which I would not quote lightly)—until she dies a child at a hundred years old. (Cheers.) Sir, I cannot think that this Meeting ought to separate, without taking some notice of a Gentleman

whose judgment has gone hand in hand with his courage,—whose courage and whose wisdom, whose zeal and whose piety, whose patience and whose judgment we have had occasion, in the course of the last two days, to admire more than ever. (Loud cheers.) I leave the suggestion to the judgment of the Chair, but I cannot help thinking, that a Meeting like this ought not to separate, without some expression of the sense it entertains of the obligations under which the Protestants of the united Empire are laid to Gentlemen who—sacrificing much that must be dear to them, bursting the bonds of party connexion on either side of the House—have stood forward to defend, what they believe to be the dearest interests of Britons everywhere. (Cheers.) Sir, I do think the Country owes a lasting debt of gratitude to the Minority on this occasion. (Loud cheers.) I think, that, when men like Mr. Fox Maule—(cheers)—I will not go farther at present—I name him but as the type of a class—I think, that, when men like Mr. Fox Maule come forward, and divorce themselves, if it be only on a single occasion, from the Parties with whom they have acted through the whole course of their political lives—Parties whom they have strengthened with their influence and adorned with their talents—when they make such sacrifices of feeling, for the sake of what we hold to be far dearer than Party ties, and for the sake of what is inadequately represented in the House of Commons—when they come forward, not as the Representatives of this Borough, or that County, but of the Protestant Christianity of the Realm, then the Protestant Christianity of the Realm owes them a debt of gratitude; and, though it cannot pay the debt, it ought at least to acknowledge the obligation. (Loud cheers.) Sir, I have wandered from my text, as preachers sometimes have the privilege of doing: but I hope I have not wandered from the subject which brings us together to-night—allegiance to our common Protestantism, and a temporary oblivion of all other differences—whether political or religious—(cheers)—and resistance, by every legal and constitutional means, to the Measure which is now proposed; coupled, at the same time, with the most fervent charity to the parties whom that Measure is supposed, but falsely supposed (as we believe) to be calculated to benefit. (Loud and continued cheering.)

The Chairman then put the Resolution, which was unanimously agreed to.

The Rev. D. R. STEVENS, Baptist Minister, of Newport, Monmouthshire.—Sir Culling, I had a few things to say, but I have very little or no time to say them in; but one or two things I may say. Our enemies are angry, because we are united. They say, How comes this about? What is the strange character of the assemblage at the Crown and Anchor? Dissenters and Churchmen meet together! Why not? I ask the *Morning Chronicle* of this day—why not? (Cheers.) I suppose it is to endow Maynooth alone, that parties, otherwise separate, are to unite. I suppose it is an admirable thing for Sir Robert Peel, and his dear and beloved cousin, Lord John Russell, and his dearer friend, Joseph Hume, and his still more beloved friend, Roebuck, to be united! But *we*, agreeing in our opposition—though differing, in some points, as to the grounds of our opposition—shall not unite; or that very *liberal* Party must pity us and revile us! I was willing to stand up, for some five or ten minutes,—because I am a Non-conformist, and because my principles as a Non-conformist lead me to oppose the Endowment of

Maynooth. The principles of other gentlemen who have addressed you, Mr. Chairman, have led them to the same point; so that we can act together without quarrelling. (Cheers.) I thought to myself, that there may be some truth in the complaint that was insinuated in the course of the day to me privately, that things were not quite equal in the Conference, and that there was a little too much on one side; and I thought to myself, "Well, I'll try to-night, to throw a little into the balance on the other side, so that we may stand fair." But, after hearing Mr. Guthrie and Mr. Noel,—whom I was proud to look upon—(loud cheers)—never having seen them before—I do not find it necessary to say one word upon that point. My brethren, if they will permit me to call them so, of the Church of England, are not the less Churchmen when they go from this Meeting. They have abandoned nothing. I can assure you, I am, at this moment, not less a Baptist Non-conformist than heretofore. I have abandoned nothing: but I act with *them*, in opposing the Grant to Maynooth. That is the substance of my defence against the *liberal Morning Chronicle*. Assuredly we have come to strange times. The *Times* will not believe the *Standard*, and I will not believe the *Morning Chronicle*. (Laughter.) I am glad to think, that the Tories prove they will think for themselves; and, as a Whig and a Baptist and a Protestant, I dare to think for myself. It is time for us to be placed in circumstances, in which we must take our stand, and act upon it, in opposition to our usual leaders. Sir Robert Peel has done this for us (small thanks to him.) (Laughter.) We will take the deed, and not the will. (Hear, hear.) He never intended it; but he has done it. Good things men do—good in their results, but not in their intention; and, amongst the results brought about in the inscrutable movements of God's providence, this is one of the most remarkable recorded upon the page of the world's history. Last week—(was it not?)—somebody asked Sir Robert Peel, whether he knew of the grand assemblage of Englishmen in London being held? "No," I think he said.

The CHAIRMAN.—*A monster meeting.* (Cheers.)

The Rev. D. R. STEVENS.—I thank you for the term. The Premier said, in effect, I am not going to be diverted from my course by anything of that kind. When that was repeated to me, I told my friend who said so, "Never mind; I am not going to be disturbed by that; I know the history of Sir Robert Peel too well." (Cheers.) Sir Robert Peel has not been the most undisturbable man in this Country. (Laughter.) I am not very old—I wish I were not so old; but I am old enough to remember some grave disturbances, in his mind, and in his conduct. I remember some strange changes he has come to and avowed; quite as strange, perhaps more so, than if to-morrow evening he were to say, "Mr. Speaker, I abandon the Maynooth Endowment Bill." (Cheers.) I do not say that he means to do so. I am afraid he has not enough virtue: but I know that he has postponed the Third Reading of the Bill. He was not going to listen—the thing had been discussed ten days in the House of Commons; was not that enough? Would he see your motley crew of persons collected at the Crown and Anchor yesterday? Not he. He sent a letter to your Chairman, and said, "Not he—the thing was over." Then why not go on, and get the Third Reading as soon as possible? I do not know. I have my suspicions, or rather,

my hopes. I do not think he will read the Bill a moment earlier in consequence of this Meeting. (Loud cheering.) I thought just now, they were so kind to your early speakers, I should not have time to say a word. (Cries of "Go on.") But I was going to say, I have preached in my own tongue, in the language of my own Country—(of course the finest language in the world.) (Laughter and cheers.) I have frequently preached in my own language to seven thousand people at a time, at the annual gatherings of the Nonconformist bodies amongst the mountains; but never before did I address an assembly presenting nothing before me but the faces of men. We always had women—our mothers and sisters and wives. But here is an assemblage of men. I never thought—I have made the remark before, but could not help it—that men's faces were so handsome. (Loud laughter and cheers.) I have long been accustomed to look for handsomeness to a woman's face—my mother's face first, my sister's face next. But *here*, when we—— [The person who had previously interrupted the Meeting exclaimed, "I thought we were meeting about Church Rates." (Cries of "Turn him out.")] He will do no harm, if you make no noise. He is good-tempered. (Laughter.) We are here brought together, without the other sex, for good reasons; with earnest minds, and the earnestness of those minds beaming in your faces; a finer sight was never presented in this Hall. (Cheers.) And I address you, as Britons and as Protestants, being one of your number, and invite you, in addition to the invitation and the earnest exhortations already delivered to you, to persist—to leave nothing undone that you can accomplish, to effect this object; to think it possible, that you can conquer Sir Robert Peel; not to dismiss from your minds the probability—(cheers)—to reckon upon the possibility of conquering him by means of the Peers; to think it is barely possible, that the people of this Country may induce (by having recourse to constitutional methods) our Queen to say in her heart, and to act upon the principle, "I will not be a party to carrying a Measure against the declared opinions of the whole of England and Scotland, and of the best interests of Ireland." (Loud cheers.) I say, look upon this as a probability, and do your duty. And suppose you fail at last; why you will have done your duty. (Loud cheers.) I have great pleasure in moving—

"That in this crisis of our affairs, it becomes us, as a considerate Assembly, to look to the future; that it is quite evident to this Meeting, that the Protestant interests of this Empire are put in a state of fearful peril by the course proposed to be pursued by Her Majesty's Government; and that, connecting this circumstance with the position of the same sacred interests elsewhere, it becomes their indispensable duty, to arrange for a great Protestant Confederation,—to embrace this Country, the Continent, and the World, that, by sympathy, correspondence, and united action, they may be prepared to meet a powerful and united foe."

The CHAIRMAN then announced James Heald, Esq., of Stockport. (Loud cheers.) (A gentleman remarked, of Manchester.)

JAMES HEALD, Esq.—Sir, it is a matter of little consequence to this Meeting, whether the person who speaks be from Stockport or Manchester, if he utters that which is only the re-echo of what he has heard at both places. (Cheers.) I had the honour of presiding at as large a Meeting as

this, composed almost entirely of males, in the town of Manchester; and I put it to that Meeting, in order to secure a hearing for every speaker, to show how quiet they could be,—as one method of supporting Protestantism on a great public occasion; and there was the most awful stillness which I ever observed in the course of my life. I am not about to trouble you with a speech at this late hour of the night; but, being a layman, I think I have a claim on your indulgence, which none of the preceding speakers could possibly pretend to. (Cheers.) I am a layman; and I have lived long enough to know, that laymen have a claim on laymen for that indulgence, which is not required by Gentlemen of the cloth, (laugh,) who are in the habit, from week to week, of addressing large assemblies. (Cheers.) I respond from my heart to the noble sentiments which have been uttered by Mr. Noel, in answer to the menace of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel. (Cheers.) He has attempted to force this Measure on the Protestants of the Country, by menace. I say, by menace we will never be convinced, (loud cheers,) and to menace we will never submit. (Continued cheers.) And I am prepared to say, that the sentiment has gone forth from Stockport, to our County Members for the northern division of Chester, in answer to the menace of Sir Robert Peel:—and I ask you, whether you are prepared to respond to that sentiment? for by it I am prepared to abide, for better or worse,—that we Protestants, in opposing this Grant to Maynooth, are prepared to stand by all the consequences that may result to this Country, to-day, henceforth, and for ever, in defence of Protestantism; (loud cheers;) and that we will not sell, at any price that can be offered to us, the liberties, the rights, the privileges, the blessings, Civil and Religious, of our Protestantism. (Cheers.) And we challenge the whole Country to produce a Meeting of more loyal subjects than that which I have the honour of addressing. (Cheers.) We never will submit. (Cheers.) Do I speak your sentiments? (“Yes, yes,” and cheers.) We never will allow the British Diadem to be laid at the feet of Rome,—(tremendous cheering,)—as though, having tried the House of Brunswick, we found them wanting, and were willing to exchange the freedom and toleration, the rights and liberties of Protestantism, for the bonds of slavery and the degradation of Rome. (Continued cheers.) That is one thing to which I wish to bear testimony as a layman. Another remark which I would make is this, that, if our common Christianity is to be held sacred in this Country, it is in the hands, breasts, and bosoms of that section of society before whom I stand. (Cheers.) We have tried the mighty ones of the earth, and found them wanting. (Hear, hear.) The hope of our Religion is on the constituency of this Realm; and the Realm will not be Protestant, if you are not prepared to do your duty. The proceedings of this Conference will be wanting, in point and adequate result, unless you are prepared to adopt something like the principle embodied in the Resolution. What sacrifices are you prepared for? What sacrifices of time and money? What sacrifices are you prepared for at the next Election? (Hear, hear.) Is all this high-toned feeling to evaporate in the atmosphere of Exeter Hall? (Cheers.) Dare you tell the Members of both Houses of Parliament, at this important crisis, that this is but the beginning of the outbreak? (Loud cheers.) I was very unwilling to delay the deliberations of the Conference; but I heard, to-day, some rather incautious expres-

sions from younger men than myself,—as though this feeling was in danger of evaporating. *I can afford to wait: can you?* (Cheers.) Is our cause likely to fail by the lapse of a few days, if it is based on Truth? Will it make any difference in the strength of the Memorial to be presented to the Queen, to interpose Her royal Prerogative to turn aside iniquity? (Cheers.) I say, No. (Cheers.) I have judged wrong of the people of Lancashire, if that be the case: I have judged wrong of my fellow-subjects. My opinion is, that we are just beginning,—that we are just rousing the lion,—that he is shaking his mane,—and that we shall, very shortly,—if we are faithful to our trust,—be the means of lighting up a fire in England which will never be quenched. (Loud cheers.) I will do anything, as a payer to the revenue of this Country, to ameliorate the condition of Ireland. As far as money is concerned, was the voice of Britain ever heard, when Sir Robert Peel came to Parliament, and, in the first instance, proposed the Income Tax upon England, exempting Ireland? Were any Petitions presented by us, praying that Ireland should not be exempted? (Hear, hear.) If this had been a mere vote of money, the present Meeting would never have been called. (Hear, hear.) Will any one tell me, that, if the question of peace or war, amity or strife, is to be settled in Ireland, it will be done by the payment of £26,000? Did the British Empire ever settle a great question by the payment of such a small sum of money? (Cheers.) It is perfectly absurd. The French press gives us credit for this,—that no sum of money will buy a British conscience; and I am prepared to say, that no sum of money will ever buy mine. (Cheers.) And do I not express your sentiments? (Loud cheers.) If I do, you ought to show it before the public, by every act and at every opportunity; and let your voice, and influence, and power be felt, through every grade of society, to the Throne itself. (Cheers.) We must know nothing of drawing back,—of withholding the expressions of our public sentiments and opinions; whilst, on the other hand, I yield to no man in this Country, in my deference to the powers [that be,—whether Whig or Tory. I never could prevail on myself, when in opposition to the Whig Government, to speak disrespectfully of them; but I feel more at liberty now to say, that,—with a host of men, who, on some great points, coincide in my own opinion,—I will give all up for my Religion. (Loud cheers.) I believe, that neither the commercial nor the agricultural prosperity of this Realm depends so much upon the principles of any Administration, as it depends upon the blessing of God; and I would rather take my chance, with a good conscience and the Lord on my side, for this Country, to have society in a state of chaos again,—relying upon the blessing of God and the interposition of Providence, to gather out of it the elements of future life. (Loud and rapturous cheering.)

The CHAIRMAN.—The Resolution will be supported by a Gentleman, whose office I will name first—the Chaplain of St. Nicholas Within, Dublin, the Rev. Tresham D. Gregg. (Loud cheers.)

The Rev. TRESHAM DANES GREGG.—Sir Culling Smith, I confess that I most earnestly desired the opportunity of this evening's Meeting, to bring before this magnificent assembly, crowded together in this Hall, the sentiments, not merely of myself as an Irish Protestant, but the sentiments, I believe, of all who are my brethren in the faith, as well as my countrymen. I felt extremely

anxious, at great length, to trespass upon this Meeting. I felt, that much had been given utterance to, by some of the speakers who have preceded me, in some degree compromising the position and claims of the Protestants of Ireland. I hear it asserted, with little patience, by any speaker, that the people of Ireland are its Roman Catholic inhabitants. Sir, this is not the case. The Protestants won it once; and they are able to hold it still. (Loud cheers.) I heard it said, that it was expected and believed, that, if this united Empire were threatened by a Foreign foe, Ireland would not join in resisting the enemy. I tell you, Sir, it could not. But I tell you, that the Protestant inhabitants of my native land would be able, in that day of danger, to retain that Country in their hands, and to trample upon the traitors that would assail our Protestantism. I trust, that it may not, for one single moment, be supposed, that one thought animates the heart of an Irish Protestant, that is not fraught with affection for his Roman Catholic Countrymen. Sir, we love them; we would do them good. But allow me briefly to state a sentiment, that I certainly think of vast importance. It is *kindred in faith* that constitutes true fraternity; and I regard myself as more the brother of an American Protestant, or of a French Protestant, or of a Protestant in any part of the globe, than I regard myself as the brother of an Idolater, though he be of the same Country. (Hear, hear.) I remember one who said, "Ye are all the children of Abraham by faith in Christ Jesus." I believe it is the same faith in Jesus Christ, that makes us feel ourselves to be the children of one Common Parent; and that it is the true source of the strongest attachment that can bind human hearts together. I love my Roman Catholic countrymen, and I pity them. I love my brother Protestants in England, and I honour them. And I can tell you, Sir, that, were it not for a deep conviction in the Protestant heart of Ireland, that England was sound, and that England was Protestant, we should, in that Country, long since have formed a common league and covenant for the Repeal of the Union. But loving you—regarding you as brethren—considering that you are faithful to your principles; and that—though circumstances might for awhile have made you look upon the difficulties to which we were subjected with something like indifference—when the time came, you would be, as you always were, faithful champions of our common faith; that belief made us stand aloof from every combination that might contemplate division from you; and led us to hope (and the hope has been realized) that we should all, at length, be engaged in the common fight, in the common cause, and share the common victory. (Cheers.) But, Mr. Chairman, I shall trespass no further. (Cries of "Go on!") I know you say "Go on," from a feeling of courtesy; but, considering the late hour of the evening, I would rather not occupy your attention further. Mr. Chairman, this must not be our last great Meeting; and I claim the privilege of making an early speech the next night. Let me have the privilege of bringing Irish sentiments and Protestant feelings before such thousands as are assembled here this evening. (Hear, hear.) I could not think of wearying this assembly, by occupying your time with any lengthened discussion this night. But, Mr. Chairman, let us have another Meeting. (Hear, hear.) Why should we not have a procession to the Queen? (Loud cheers.) Why should we not have a procession of the thousands that are assembled here.



this evening, and the thousands that would join them, headed by our venerated Clergy, to the Prime Minister and to the House of Commons? (Repeated cheers.) This Meeting must be but one of a series. The Bill must not pass. (Cheers.) Measures may be contrived to prevent it. (Hear, hear.) I almost regretted to see the patience which seemed to contemplate its passing, several times this evening, and an intention to look at an ulterior remedy at the next Election, rather than such an instant, immediate, active, energetic movement as might defy the obstinacy of the Minister, and disappoint his hopes. (Cheers.) I trust that the sense of a large number present will have its due weight on your mind and that of the Committee; and that a future occasion will be afforded *to me* of speaking, and *to all* of hearing. I have statements to make, which I could not completely do before twelve o'clock to-night. With great pleasure I support the Resolution. (Cheers.)

The CHAIRMAN.—I cannot give any pledge as to a procession: but I believe I may say, that there will be another great Meeting in this Hall.

The Resolution was then put, and unanimously agreed to.

The Rev. Dr. HALLEY, Congregational Minister, of Manchester.—I think, Sir Culling, you are really hard, in calling upon me, at this hour of the evening, to address the Meeting. I trust the Gentleman who has just spoken will excuse me for saying, that I must regard the poor Irish Catholic as *my* brother as well as *his*; and on the most solemn consideration. I do believe, that our blessed Saviour, who was crucified on Calvary for my sins, was as kindred and fraternal to every poor Irish peasant as to me: and that the blood which flowed in His veins, and was shed for my sins, was kindred and fraternal to every child of Ireland as to me: and, if I had the opportunity, I would embrace every Irish Catholic, as well as every Irish Protestant, as my brother for whom Christ died: \* and, if an Idolator he be, I feel it an obligation to do all that in me lies, to lead him to the Saviour. (Hear, hear.) Because a brother he is to me, and as a brother I feel for him. On the question under discussion, at this late hour, I have nothing to say. I have been asked indeed, in visiting several Members, How they are to govern Ireland?—and, If this money is not for the good government of Ireland? I say at once, instead of violating the conscientious feelings and Religious principles of the people of this Country, and doing an act of injustice for the sake of expediency, send out the £26,000 to Conciliation Hall at once,—give it to O'Connell at once; and let *him* govern Ireland as he can, rather than violate principle for the sake of expediency. (Hear, hear.) And so, I say, the very question seems to me, to be a confession, that we cannot govern Ireland without a concession of principle.

---

\* These considerations certainly do not set aside *the peculiar bond of brotherhood that binds together all true believers in Christ*. Mr. Gregg evidently did not intend to question the brotherhood in Adam,—the partaking of a common nature,—or the unlimited call to sinners, as such, to look to Christ and be saved;—in regard to which, he would both love, and labour for, his Romish fellow-countrymen. But those who are made “the children of God by adoption and grace,” are surely *Brethren* in a yet higher, closer, more enduring sense. (Gal. iii. 26—29, Eph. iv. 4—6.) And they should not forget it. The commandment, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,” (Lev. xix. 18,) does not set aside the special commandment of Christ, that His disciples should love one another. (John xiii. 34, 35.)—EDITOR.

Now it is said, Whatever you do, reject not the Measure. "Trample upon its authors, if you please: turn us out," said Sir Robert Peel, "if you please: but reject not our Measure; for the consequences will be terrible, and rebellion threatens." It appears to me not to be constitutional, for a British Minister to make that an argument for carrying his measures. (Cheers.) It seems to me, that a British Minister ought to consider carefully, before he brings forth a measure, the consequences of the rejection of which may be so deplorable. It seems to me, that the British House of Commons has a right to decide upon the question. If it be a good Measure, pass it by all means. If it be a bad Measure, reject it by all means; and leave the consequences. But, good or bad as the Bill may be, it is not for the author of it to say, "Pass it, pass it; or the consequences will be such as I dare not contemplate." Be they what they may, they belong to the man who introduced the Measure: be they what they may, the man who introduced the Measure is responsible for them; and not they who resist the Bill upon the ground of its injustice. (Cheers.) It has been said, "The Queen's visit to Ireland depends upon the Measure (laughter:) and would you have her go there, without an act of justice and favour, amidst scowls and frowns?" But is there one of us, Irish, English, or Scotch, Wesleyan, Churchman, or Dissenter, who would not give twice, ten times the money, to make the heart of the widow in Ireland leap for joy? and to comfort the orphan, relieve the distressed, heal the sick, raise up the helpless,—do anything for Ireland? But I say,—with a heart that beats warm with loyalty,—with a heart that longs for these results, and an anxious wish that both Countries should be united as one in peace and justice,—equal laws with no ascendancy—(in my heart I say it),—it is rather too much to expect, that principle,—the sanctity of Religion, the Majesty of God's Law,—should be made the means to grace the pageantry even of a royal procession—chained to that chariot which will bear the Majesty of these Realms, I hope in safety, to the Capital of the Sister Kingdom. (Hear, hear.) The evening is too far advanced, to allow me to address to you the few observations I had intended to make on the present occasion; and certainly I cannot claim any right to address you on another occasion. (Hear, hear.) With these remarks, I will content myself with moving the Resolution which has been put into my hand:

"That, to effect this important object, the Central Anti-Maynooth Committee be requested provisionally to take charge of the requisite arrangements; and be prepared to submit to a General Meeting, called by themselves, the platform and the officers best fitted to sustain and carry on such an Institution."

The Rev. THOMAS SCALES, of Leeds.—Sir, with great confidence can I invite this large Meeting, to confide to the Anti-Maynooth Committee the duties which are involved in the Resolution which has just been proposed: and to you, the Deputations, and those who are now assembled, I would wish to say one word, to enable them to fulfil those duties with which you have entrusted them. I have had the opportunity of knowing, that great expenses have been incurred, and great expenses must inevitably be incurred, in carrying out the Resolutions. A Resolution to that effect is, I understand, to come before the Meeting: but my own observation and experience enable

me to speak on the subject, as well as any other Gentleman who may be appointed to move the Resolution : and a word at parting may, very properly, come from one, who has taken some small part, within the last few days, in the operations which have been going on in this great Metropolis—operations on which I look with sentiments of gratitude, and thankfulness, and joy, in having been permitted to take a humble part : and which, I trust, by the Providence of an all-wise and gracious God, will conduce to those results, which,—as Protestants, as Britons, as lovers of the Queen, of Ireland, and of its best and dearest interests,—we hope will be conducted to a happy and favourable issue. (Cheers.)

The Resolution was carried unanimously.

The Rev. R. MACDONALD.—Sir, I remember, when a friend saw a number of persons sympathizing in a case of distress,—to bring it to a point, he put this question—“Friend, how much do you *pay*?” Now, I think, to bring the Meeting to a satisfactory conclusion, we must come to this great question,—not how many Petitions we will sign,—how many Deputations we will send ; but how much money we will give, to carry on this great movement ? and I have full confidence, that we shall not be wanting in this matter : and, if a movement that concerns the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland together, does require funds, I am quite sure they will not be wanting. One reason why I have been selected to speak to this matter is, that I can say something about the Free Church expenses. When the struggle was going on, which eventually led to the great disruption, we—the Ministers who felt deeply interested in the matter—agreed from the beginning,—seeing the expenses that would be incurred,—to tax ourselves so much off our incomes ; and, for several years, we paid that tax, till the struggle came to a conclusion. But, when we were called again to make a great movement for the completion of the struggle, you are aware how it was completed. And although £30,000, £50,000, or £100,000 may be required, to carry on this movement for years,—I believe the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland are prepared to give all that money. Feeling the want of schools, when the disruption took place at Glasgow, I proposed that £50,000 should be raised at once for the object ; and, as we were building our Churches, many persons smiled at this, as totally out of the question. But, nevertheless, the Assembly were led to approve of it ; and, in the course of six months, I was able to report, that the value of £50,000 had been subscribed. (Loud cheers.) When I mentioned the matter, some went away afraid. I was sent out. One friend gave £1000 for the College, to begin with. When I got that, I said, I am sure twenty friends of the Free Church will give, each of them £1000 additional. In the course of two months, twenty friends of the Free Church came down with it, and our College was secure. Might not the same thing have been done by our friends in Ireland? They did not ask for this Grant. If we poor Free Churchmen, in two months, raised £20,000, I am sure *they* are able to do it. The great point to be settled in the matter is this, I think : before leaving the Meeting, every friend should inquire, “What shall *I* give for this object?” My reason for asking you to make up your minds, and fix the sum, is this. I never left a single Meeting, until the thing was done on the spot. I have travelled all over Scotland, and never got less than £100

subscribed on the spot; and, even in poor Shetland, I got £100 for these schools; and I should think it disgraceful, if the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland failed for want of funds. God has given us men,—has raised up true-hearted men, in whom we can place full confidence; and God be praised for that. God, who has given us the men, will give us the means too,—the silver and gold too. I know His promise—"Open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it." And I trust your Deputations, when they return, will be willing to believe this fully, and proclaim it to the people; and I hope there will be a holy rivalry on this point.—I hope all Denominations will strive to provoke one another, for the purpose of seeing who will give most cheerfully, and who will give the soonest, for the promotion of this great cause. Not only must we give, but we must give largely. Our blessed Master said, "Freely ye have received, freely give." Yes, freely, largely, liberally may we give,—when we think what we have received at His hands. I remember a good man once said—and it is a very important saying—that when he came to his dying bed, he would have his greatest grief and his greatest joy—his greatest grief, to think he had done so little for Jesus; and his greatest joy, to think that Jesus had done so much for him. I trust we shall be willing to come cheerfully forward; and I hope, that not a single friend will leave the room, until he has resolved what to give out of his income; and I am sure none will regret it, none will be poorer for Christ. Although hundreds and thousands have been given in Scotland, I never met a man who said he was the poorer for it. "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth." It would be a most admirable system, to circulate Anti-Maynooth cards in all directions. I hope to see a great rivalry amongst Churchmen, Wesleyans, and others: and it will be to me a matter of the greatest joy and delight, to assist in carrying out this great object. (Cheers.) I have great pleasure in moving—

"That, as considerable expense has been necessarily incurred by the Central-Anti-Maynooth Committee in opposing the Bill thus far, and as great expenses will yet have to be incurred, in the continued opposition to the Measure which has been determined upon,—this Meeting pledges itself to contribute liberally to the funds of the Committee, and to promote subscriptions for the same object among their friends; and the more so, as this Meeting contemplates, not merely transient action, but continued effort."

The Rev. EDWARD PIZEY, of St. Peter's Church, Saffron Hill.—In seconding the Resolution, Sir, I will not detain the Meeting further than to remind them, that Petitions are not got up in London for nothing; and that money is required for the services of clerks, and for other purposes. And, as we are determined not to rest, in our course of opposition to what we feel to be one of the most iniquitous measures ever proposed in a British House of Commons, until we have got thoroughly rid of it, you must be prepared to give money, money, money into your Treasurer's hands. (Cheers.) This is one of the means, which will enable us to send the Maynooth Bill back to Rome, whence it came. (Cheers.)

The Resolution was then put, and carried.

GEORGE ROCHFORD CLARKE, Esq.—I have great pleasure in moving a Resolution, in which, I am sure, you will all concur; and, at this late hour,

I would not say one word, if I did not consider it serviceable to our cause. I have acted with our excellent Chairman upon the Central Committee; and, as we differ from each other on one point, I believe I may bear my testimony to the great wisdom and judgment he has manifested, in forgetting that point, or any point that might have a tendency to divide us. The great thing we have to guard against at this moment is *division*. We must remember, that, amongst the Roman Catholics, there is one sect, upon which our eyes are fixed, and which is seeking to divide us; that is, the sect of the Jesuits: and rest assured, that, if they can make use of any point upon which they know we differ, and can contrive to bring that point forward at any of our Meetings, they will succeed in damaging our cause. I heard, this day, from a friend of mine, that it had been remarked, that there had been a slight attempt to do what would have created a division. A Member of Parliament asked, If it were true? *There* is a circumstance which proves the importance of this matter. What is to be our resting point of union? What is that which we are to keep before us, as the centre of our union? Rome talks of its unity. I say that Rome's unity is not to be compared to the unity of the Church of Christ. (Hear, hear.) I do not merely speak of the division of the Church of Rome into sects,—of the Jansenists, and the Jesuits, who have persecuted the Jansenists unto death; or of the Dominicans and Franciscans, who have differed upon points which have caused many to die the death; I do not speak of the unity which consists in holding to the Pope; but of that unity which consists in holding the Head, which is Christ. (Hear, hear.) What is the Catholic Church? The mystical body of Christ; the blessed communion of all His faithful people. *That* is the principle which has actuated those who have formed the Committee, and taken the lead on this question; and I think it desirable to bear this public testimony to the principle upon which they were united in action,—because of the conduct of some, who seem to be holding back, for fear certain principles might be brought forward which they deprecate. I have to propose a Resolution, which is as follows:—

“That the most cordial thanks of this Meeting be presented to Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart., for his constant, zealous, and able services, in conducting the opposition to the Maynooth Endowment Bill; and particularly, for his impartial conduct in the Chair this evening.”

The attention of our excellent Chairman has been unremitting; and his zealous and able services have been of the greatest value to us. The Conference we held yesterday, and the Meeting to-day, are evidences of the importance of his services, in conducting the opposition to the Maynooth Endowment Bill; and our thanks are particularly due to him, for his impartial conduct in the Chair this evening. (Loud cheers.)

EDWARD BAINES, Jun., Esq.—It is offering but a very feeble acknowledgment to say, after witnessing, for more than a fortnight, the unwearied exertions, the high principle, the admirable zeal and ability displayed by Sir Culling Smith, that a greater debt was never paid, than that which you will endeavour to discharge, when you pass this Resolution. (Cheers.)

J. D. PAUL, Esq. then put the Resolution, which was carried unanimously, and followed by cheers, with three times three.

Sir CULLING E. SMITH—Gentlemen, you are far too kind to me. I have done nothing in this matter,—except, at an early period of the proceedings which have taken place, to anticipate the feeling which has been so strongly evinced. In thanking you for your kindness, allow me to say, that, although I am tired, I am not too tired to say, that, as long as I have a head to think, or a hand to write, or a tongue to speak, they shall all be devoted to the Great Cause in which we are now engaged. (Loud and repeated cheering.)

The Meeting then broke up, at a late hour.

\*\*\* How important that the Resolutions passed at this Meeting—especially those which have reference to *permanent and united action*—and that such decided sentiments as were expressed by James Heald, Esq., in his brief but emphatic speech—should be deeply considered by all British Protestants, who have taken an interest in the Anti-Maynooth struggle, and who desire that the cause of our common Protestantism should be maintained in this land!

There is much, in many of the speeches above reported, which is worthy to be read over, and pondered again and again, by all who know and love the Truth. It is not the momentary excitement and enthusiasm of a great public Meeting, but a course of *persevering action* in carrying out *the principles* so strongly asserted, and so cordially applauded, which can show us to be really faithful to God, and true to our professions.—EDITOR.

LIST OF DEPUTIES,  
 WHO ATTENDED THE  
**Conference**  
 OF THE  
 CENTRAL ANTI-MAYNOOTH COMMITTEE,  
 HELD AT THE  
 CROWN AND ANCHOR TAVERN, ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 30, 1845,  
 AND THE THREE FOLLOWING DAYS.

---

[GREAT pains have been taken to make this List as accurate as possible; yet it is feared, that some few mistakes may still be found in it, and, especially, that some names are omitted. The number of Deputies—the little time allowed for taking down, and accurately recording their names—the mistakes which at first occurred in writing—and the want, in some cases, of a more accurate *address*—have occasioned great difficulty in the attempt to correct the List,—which was, when first printed, from the above-mentioned causes, very inaccurate. Since then, extensive correspondence with the Deputies has enabled the Committee to correct a vast number of these mistakes, and to present the following List; in which, it is believed, that there can scarcely be any mistake, except, perhaps, in those cases, in which a sufficiently full *address* is wanting.

It should also be noted, that those Deputies, to whose names an asterisk is prefixed,\* have, since the first Meeting of the Conference, expressed their dissent from the basis of Protestant Union upon which it was founded. As they had been regularly admitted to the Conference—had received their tickets, and were registered, their names could not, it was thought, be properly omitted altogether. But it was considered to be due to them, to adopt some method of recording the dissent from the principle and proceedings of the Conference which they have since expressed.—EDITOR.]

Abbot, Beckley, Esq., Alford, Lincolnshire  
 Abbot, J. W. Esq., Poplar  
 Adams, Mr. C., Burton-on-Trent  
 Adams, E. Esq., West Mante  
 Adams, Rev. H. L., Newark  
 Alder, Rev. R., D.D., Hatton-garden, London

Aldert, Rev. R., Rugby  
 Alexander, Rev. J., Norwich  
 Alford, Rev. C. R., Rugby  
 Alford, Mr. W., Woolwich  
 Allen, Rev. J., Ashburton  
 Allott, Rev. W., Bedford  
 Anderson, G. Esq., Cleckheaton  
 Anderson, T. Esq., Manchester

---

\* These are twenty-five in number.

- Andrews, Rev. B. LL.D., West Cowes,  
Isle of Wight
- Andrews, Rev. J., Woburn
- Andrews, W. Esq., Liverpool
- Armistead, H. Esq., Marsden in Lancashire
- Armitage, E. Esq., Manchester and Salford
- Arthur, Rev. W., City-road
- Ashton, J. Y. Esq., Liverpool
- Ashton, M. Esq., Liverpool
- Ashton, W. H. Esq., Stockport
- Atherton, Rev. R. H., Worthing
- Atherton, Rev. W., Liverpool
- Avard, Rev. T., Belper
- Ayres, Mr. W., Mare-street, Hackney, London
- Backhouse, Mr., Stroud
- Backhouse, Mr., Wells
- Bacon, J. Esq., Exeter
- Bacon, Rev. W., Louth
- Badley, Mr. F., Louth
- Bagnall, Thomas, Esq., West Bromwich
- Bainbridge, Mr. C. T., Easingwold
- Bailey, Mr. R., Eaton, near Grantham
- Baines, E. Esq., Leeds
- Baines, E. jun. Esq., Leeds
- \*Baines, Mr. J., Kimbolton
- Baisler, Mr. F., (Wick) 124, Oxford-st.
- Baker, Mr. J., Chester
- Baker, —, Esq., Staines
- Baker, Mr. R., Rochdale
- Baker, Rev. W., St. Mary-le-bone
- Ballance, —, Esq., Taunton
- Ballantine, J. Esq., Scotland
- Bancroft, G. Esq., Ashton-under-Lyne
- Bara, Mr. T., Lancaster
- Bardeley, Rev. B., Bromley, Kent
- Barret, Rev. A., 7, Grove, Hackney
- Barrow, J. Esq., Altringham
- Barton, F. Esq., Fermanagh
- Barton, Rev. W., 2, Chesterfield-street, King's Cross
- Bateman, J. Esq., Congleton
- Bateman, J. Esq., Elm, Huntingdon
- Baty, J. Esq., St. Mary-le-bone
- Baynes, Rev. J. A., Poplar
- Beach, J. Esq., Redmarley Park, near Ledbury
- Bealey, R. Esq., Radcliffe, Bury, Lancash.
- Beamish, Rev. H. H., Norfolk-crescent, Hyde-park
- Bean, Rt. Esq., Holt, Norfolk
- Bean, Rev. W., Tulse-hill
- Becket, Mr. J., Manchester
- Beddow, Rev. B., Barnsley
- Beecham, Rev. J., Grimsby
- Beet, J. W. Esq., Sheffield
- Beet, Mr. Thos., Sheffield
- Beith, Rev. A., Stirling
- Bell, Rev. A., Birmingham
- Bell, Rev. J., Ashton-under-Lyne
- Bennet, Rev. Dr. J. B. Brunswick-street, Islington
- Bennet, Rev. T., Islington
- Bentley, R. Esq., London
- Bently, T. W. Esq., London
- Betts, W. Esq., Southampton
- Beresford, Rev. G., Hoby, Leicestershire
- Berger, Mr., Upper Homerton
- Berney, Mr. W., Truro
- Berry, Josiah, Esq., Truro
- Bevan, Rev. J., Oakham
- Bew, Mr. R., Bilston
- Biddulph, S. Esq., Nottingham
- \*Bidgood, Mr. H., Vigo-street, Westminster
- Biggs, Mr. W., Bromham, Bedford
- Birch, T. Esq., Leek
- Bird, Rev. J., Hammersmith
- Birrell, Rev. C. M., Liverpool
- Bishop, Mr. J., Bridgewater
- Birt, Mr. D., High-street, Southwark
- Blackburn, Rev. J., Pentonville
- Blackburn, Rev. J. Conningsby, Boston
- Blackhurst, W. Esq., Preston
- Blackley, Mr. J., Nottingham
- Blackwood, Dr., Dublin
- Blakeney, Rev. R. P., Nottingham
- Bollen, Mr. F., Pentonville
- Bond, Mr. J., Lancaster
- Boodle, Rev. —, Sydenham
- Boulton, Rev. T., Cranbrook
- Boumphrey, Mr. Jos., Liverpool
- Bourne, Mr. J. H., Partney, near Spilsby
- Bourne, Mr. W., King-square, London
- Bouverie, Hon. E. P., M.P., Kilmarnock
- Bowcroft, Mr. W. B., Ashton
- Bowman, Mr. W. Jun., Buckley Mountain, Flintshire



- Boxall, A. Esq., London  
 Boyce, Rev. W. B., Bolton  
 Bradley, Mr., Broadstairs  
 Brame, Mr. R., Lowestoft  
 Braithwaite, Mr., Hammersmith  
 Brewster, Sir David, St. Andrew's, N.B.  
 Bridge, John, Esq., Ridgemount, Bedford  
 Bridge, Rev. R. L., Maldon  
 Bridge, Rev. S., Camberwell  
 Briggs, Mr., Horncastle  
 Briggs, Mr. T., Hanerton  
 Bright, Rev. J., Woolwich  
 Bright, Rev. L., Newark  
 \*Bright, Rev. T. L., Newport, Monmouthshire  
 Broad, Rev. J., Hitchin  
 Broadbent, Rev. J. S., Belper  
 Broadhead, —, Esq., Boxford, Suffolk  
 \*Brock, Rev. W., Norwich  
 Brook, S. Esq., Diss, Norfolk  
 Brooke, J. Esq., Bollington, near Macclesfield  
 Brough, Mr. John, jun., Leek  
 Brown, Rev. A. M., Cheltenham  
 Brown, Mr. B., Derby  
 Brown, Rev. J. B., Derby  
 Brown, Rev. J., Higham Ferrers  
 Brown, John, Esq., Lambeth  
 Brown, John, Esq., Wareham  
 Brown, Rev. Dr., Aberdeen  
 Brown, J. S. Esq., Halifax  
 Brown, Rev. S., Ledbury  
 \*Browne, Rev. J. Lowestoft  
 Buck, E. Esq., Norfolk  
 Buckler, H. Esq., Islington  
 Buckpitt, Rev. Jas., Torrington  
 Buckspitt, Mr. K., Handsworth  
 Budden, Rev. J., Ringwood, Hants  
 Bull, Rev. E., Pentlow  
 Bull, Rev. G. S., Birmingham  
 Bullock, E. Esq., Handsworth, near Birmingham  
 Bunds, J. Esq., Brompton, near Manchester  
 Bunting, Rev. Jabez, D.D., Myddelton-square, London  
 Bunting, T. P. Esq., Manchester  
 Bunting, Rev. W. M., Highgate Rise, London  
 Burd, J. Esq., Salford  
 Burn, Rev. H., Abergavenny  
 Burnett, Rev. W., Holt, Norfolk  
 Burnham, Rev. W., Great Marlow  
 Burns, Mr. T., London  
 Burton, Mr. J., Cheltenham  
 Burton, John, Esq., Leeds  
 Buswell, Rev. W., Widford, near Chelmsford  
 Butler, Mr. J., Wakefield  
 Butler, Rev. C. R., Catherington  
 Buttress, J. J. Esq., Upper Holloway  
 Buttress, J. Esq., London  
 Cadd, Mr., Bridford  
 Cadman, Mr. W., Cromford, near Wirksworth  
 Cadwell, Rev. J., Dublin  
 Cains, Wm. Esq., London  
 Caird, A. Esq., Stanmore  
 Callingham, J. Esq., Lincoln  
 Campbell, D. Esq., Higham Ferrers  
 Cameron, Rev. G., Saffron Hill, London  
 Campbell, Rev. H. N., Hanwell  
 Campbell, Rev. J., D.D., City-road, London  
 Campbell, Rev. J. R., Edinburgh  
 Cannon, Mr. Alderman, Bolton  
 Cardall, Rev. W., West Bromwich  
 Carter, Mr. W. B., Nottingham  
 Carter, Rev. T., Fenny Stratford  
 Cartwright, Mr., London  
 Cartwright, G. Esq., Lyme Regis  
 Carver, Rev. J. W., Winfarthing  
 Carver, W. C. Esq., Melbourne, near Royston  
 Cassels, J. Esq., Acacia-road, London  
 Cave, G. Esq., Piddington, Northampton  
 Challiner, E. Esq., Burslem  
 Chalmers, Rev. W., Dorset-place, London  
 Chambers, Mr. J. W., Durham  
 Chambers, R. H., Esq., Ashton-under-Lyne  
 Chambers, Mr. W. G., Durham  
 Chamberlane, Rev. J., Four Elms, Bradstead  
 Champneys, Mr. W., Epping  
 Chandler, B. Esq., Shelbourne  
 Chapman, Rev. R. Oldham  
 Chapney, Mr. S., St. Austell

- Charles, Rev. G., Bradford  
 Cheesborough, W. Esq., Bradford, Yorks.  
 Childs, Mr. W. B., Harleston  
 Choune, Thos. Esq., London  
 Christopher, Mr. S., Bagshot  
 Chubb, C. Esq., St. Paul's Church-yard,  
 London  
 Chubb, J. Esq., ditto  
 Clapson, Mr. R., Exmouth  
 Clark, Rev. A., Tutbury  
 Clark, J. Esq., Thetford, Essex  
 Clark, Rev. T., Ashford, Kent  
 Clark, Mr. T. N., Norton Folgate,  
 London  
 Clarke, G. R. Esq., Spring-gard., London  
 Clarke, Mr. R., Wisbeach  
 Claxton, T. Esq., West Cowes  
 Clay, Rev. C. Bollington, Macclesfield  
 Clementson, Rev. W., Nottingham  
 Clough, W. Esq., Pontefract  
 Cotes, N. N. Esq., Thurso  
 Colman, Mr. Joseph, Holt, Norwich  
 Connor, Alderman, Bolton  
 Connell, E. Esq., Manchester  
 Cook, Captain W., Croydon  
 Cook, W. Esq., London  
 Cooksey, Mr. Joseph, West Bromwich  
 Cooper, A. Esq., Manchester  
 Cooper, Rev. B. H., West Bromwich  
 Cooper, C. Esq., Manchester  
 Cooper, G. Esq., Manchester  
 Cooper, G. Esq., Westbrook Moor,  
 Windsor  
 Cooper, Rev. J., Bradford, Yorkshire  
 Cooper, Mr. J., Leighton  
 Cooper, Mr. R., Oldham  
 Cooper, W. Esq., Manchester  
 Cooper, Mr. W. C., Maidenhead  
 Corderoy, Mr. J., Lambeth  
 Corderoy, W. Esq., London  
 Cosby, J. Esq., Newport  
 Cottingham, Mr. W. J., Liverpool  
 Cottle, Rev. Dr., Taunton  
 Crampin, Rev. J., Streatham  
 Cranswick, Mr. W., Leeds  
 Crawford, Rev. A., Belfast  
 Crawford, Colonel, Bath  
 Crawford, J. Esq., jun. W. S. Edinburgh  
 Critchett, Rd., Esq., Tunbridge Wells  
 Crichton, Rev. J. D., Arbroath  
 Crockett, Thomas, Esq., Cannock,  
 Walsall  
 Crockford, Rev. W., Rochester  
 Crofts, Rev. J., Luton  
 Cross, Mr. S. M., Wisbeach  
 Crossfield, W. Esq., Liverpool  
 Crossley, J. Esq., Halifax  
 Crowe, Rev. J., Bradford, Wilts  
 Crowther, Rev. J., Lambeth  
 Crowther, Mr. J. M., Manchester  
 Crump, Rev. H. J., Hendon  
 Cubit, B. Esq., Foulsham, Norfolk  
 Cuffe, Rev. T., Kennington  
 Cullen, Rev. G. D., Leith  
 Cumming, Rev. G. T., Hammersmith  
 Cutts, Mr. A. H., Manchester  
 Dale, Rev. T., St. Bride's, Fleet-street,  
 London  
 Dall, J. M. Esq., Preston  
 Daniell, Mr. J. W., London  
 Davies, Mr. D., Merthyr Tydvil  
 Davies, Rev. H., Leeds  
 Davies, Rev. J., Leamington  
 Davies, R. Esq., Anglesea  
 Davies, Rev. T., Maidenhead  
 Davies, Mr. W., Canterbury  
 Davis, Mr. D., Hirwan, Merthyr Tydvil  
 Davis, Rev. J., Linton  
 Davis, Rev. J., Yarmouth  
 Davis, Thomas, Esq., Wednesbury  
 Davy, Mr. J., Accrington  
 Day, Rev. C., Mucking Vicarage, Rom-  
 ford  
 Day, Rev. R., Horncastle  
 Dean, Rev. James, Manchester  
 Denison, Rev. J., Bury, Lancashire  
 Dexter, J. C. Esq., Whitechapel-road,  
 London  
 Dixon, A. Esq., Cleckheaton  
 Dixon, Rev. M. C., Bingham  
 Dixon, Rev. J., D.D., Milton Street,  
 Dorset Square, London  
 Dobney, Rev. H. H., Maidstone  
 Dobson, Rev. J. P., Orange-street,  
 London  
 Dodds, Mr., Claremont-square, London  
 Douglass, Mr. G., Brookshaw, nr. Bury  
 Dove, C. Esq., Leeds  
 Downes, Mr. J., Whitstable  
 Dowson, Rev. H., Bradford, Yorkshire

- Drewett, Rev. W., Diss, Norfolk  
 Duckley, Rev. J., Belper  
 Dudding, Rev. H. N., St. Albans  
 Dukes, Rev. C., Kingsland  
 Dunn, Rev. S., Halifax  
 Durley, Mr., City-road  
 Durley, Mr. R., Whitchurch, Bucks  
 Dyer, Rev. W. H., West Bromwich  
 Dyson, Mr. J., Huddersfield  
 East, Mr. G., Orange-street, London  
 Eastwood, Rev. T., Leeds  
 Eathorne, Rev. J., Redruth  
 Eaton, Rev. J., Brockley  
 Ebrington, Viscount, M.P., London  
 Eckett, Rev. R., Argyle-square, King's  
     Cross, London  
 Eckington, Rev. J., London  
 Edgar, Rev. Dr., Belfast  
 Edmonds, Rev. A., Rugby  
 Edwards, Rev. J., Swinton  
 Edwards, Mr. R., Merthyr Tydvil  
 Eglinton, Robert, Esq., Woburn-street,  
     London  
 Elliott, E. F. Esq., Four Elms, Kent  
 Elliott, J. Esq., Westminster-bridge-  
     road, Lambeth  
 Elliott, J. S. Esq., Denmark-hill, Lon-  
     don  
 Ellis, Rev. E., Burslem  
 England, Mr. J., Manchester  
 Evans, J. C. Esq., Hans-place, London  
 \*Evans, Rev. B., Scarborough  
 Evans, Rev. S., Westbury  
 Evans, Mr. S., Ottery St. David's  
 Evered, R. G. Esq., J.P., Bridgewater  
 Everard, Mr. M.  
 Ewing, Rev. A., Halifax  
 Ewing, Rev. James, Dundee  
 Farmer, S. A. Esq., Reigate  
 Farmer, Thomas, Esq., Acton  
 Farrar, Rev. J., Richmond, Surrey  
 Fawcett, Mr. I., Ashton-under-Lyne  
 Fekins, Rev. R., Camberwell  
 Felkin, W. Esq., Nottingham  
 Fellows, Mr. R., Bowyer-place, Wal-  
     worth  
 Fellows, Rev. W., Cranbrook  
 Ferguson, Mr., Bolton  
 Fernie, Rev. J., Farnham, Surrey  
 Fernley, Mr. J. D., Stockport  
 Fielding, Mr. B., Oldham  
 Fielding, Mr. T., Castle Donnington  
 Finch, Rev. T. C., Brompton  
 Firth, Rev. B., Burnley  
 Fish, Rev. H., Hackney-road, London  
 Fish, Mr. R., Kettering  
 Fisher, J. Esq., Lowestoft  
 Flashman, Mr., Reigate  
 Flehan, Rev. G., Dover  
 Fletcher, Rev. J., Hanley  
 Fletcher, Mr. J., Windsor  
 Flood, Rev. J., Melbourne, Cambridge  
 Fogg, Mr. W., West Retford  
 Fok, Mr. J., Dover  
 Ford, Rev. J., Islington  
 Forley, Rev. A., Arbroath  
 Former, —, Esq., Wingham  
 Forsaith, Rev. J. E., Royston  
 Foskett, Paul, Esq., Reigate  
 Foster, Rev. C. L., Stony Stratford  
 Foster, Mr. J. T., Hertford  
 Foulks, Mr. J., Newtown, Montgomery-  
     shire  
 Fowler, T. Esq.  
 France, Rev. W., Wednesbury  
 Franklyn, Rev. Thos. W., Tunbridge  
     Wells  
 Fraser, Mr. W., Stockwell  
 French, Mr. C., Tenterden  
 Frid, T. Esq., Peckham  
 Frost, J. Esq., Wednesbury  
 Frost, Mr. S., Wolverhampton  
 Furness, J. Esq., Preston  
 Gabriel, C. J., Esq., Kennington Cross  
 Gallagher, Rev. G. H., Tralee  
 Gambler, Rev. H. J., Margate  
 Gaul, Rev. R., Staines  
 Gawthorne, Rev. J., Derby  
 Gear, Rev. W., Bradford, Wilts  
 Geden, Rev. J., Wolverhampton  
 Geddes, H. Esq., Bannockburn  
 Gee, Mr. J. C., Ashton-under-Lyne  
 Jenkins, Mr. W., Truro  
 Gilbert, Rev. Charles, Islington  
 Giles, Mr. S. M., Altrincham, near  
     Manchester  
 Gill, T. Esq.  
 Gilman, Rev. T., Newport

- Gillespie, A. Esq., Regent-square  
 Gladstone, Mr. G., Sleaford  
 Glendenning, Rev. J., Huddersfield  
 Goad, Mr. C., Brixton-hill  
 Godwin, Rev. J. H., Highbury  
 Gogulley, Rev. C., Melton Mowbray  
 Gooding, Mr., Hammersmith  
 Goodrich, Rev. J., London  
 Goodwin, Mr. J., Buckingham  
 Gordon, Rev. A., Aberdeen  
 Gordon, J. E. Esq., Hadlow House,  
 Tunbridge  
 Gore, Rev. J., Shalbourn, near Hunger-  
 ford  
 Gorham, W. Esq., Tunbridge  
 Gould, Rev. E., Ackington  
 Gould, J. Esq., Petworth  
 Gould, Rev. J., Beaconsfield  
 Goulty, Rev. I. N., Brighton  
 Govet, Rev. R., Staines  
 Greathead, Mr. T., Dewsbury  
 Greeves, Rev. J., Huddersfield  
 \*Green, Rev. S., Walworth  
 Green, T. M. Esq., Lambeth  
 Green, Mr. W., Old Swinton  
 Greenhalgh, Mr., Manchester  
 Greenwood, Mr. J., Flaxmoss, near  
 Haslington  
 Greenwood, Mr. W., Devonport  
 Gregg, Rev. T. D., Dublin  
 Gregory, Rev. B., Camden Town, Lon-  
 don  
 Greville, Rev. Dr. R. K., Edinburgh  
 Grigsby, Rev. W., Staplehurst  
 Griffiths, Rev. D., Ackington  
 Grimes, Mr. W., Newport Pagnell  
 Grimshaw, —, Esq., Colne  
 Guest, Rev. W., Bilston  
 Gurney, Rev. T. W. H., St. Philip's  
 Church, Granville-square, London  
 Gutteridge, Mr. J., Dunstable  
 Haigh, Rev. J. S., Croydon  
 Hale, M., Esq., Dewsbury  
 Hall, Rev. A., Staines  
 Hall, Rev. C., Newcastle  
 Hall, Rev. J., Cheshunt  
 Hall, Rev. S. R., Southwark  
 Halley, Rev. Dr., Manchester  
 Hamilton, Rev. J., Regent-sq., London  
 \*Hamilton, Rev. R., Lynn Regis  
 Hamilton, W. Esq., London  
 Hammond, A. Esq., Sydenham  
 Hanbury, B. Esq., Southwark  
 Hanley, Rev. J., Bristol  
 Hannah, Rev. Dr., Didsbury  
 Hansom, Mr., Newbury  
 Harding, Rev. J., Grantham  
 Harris, A., Esq., Bradford, Yorkshire  
 Harris, Rev. J., Mile-end  
 Harris, Rev. T., Macclesfield  
 \*Harris, W. D., Esq., Buckingham  
 Harrison, Rev. D., Whitstable  
 Harrison, Rev. F., Luton  
 Harrison, G. W. Esq., Wakefield  
 Harrison, Mr. C., Dalston Rise  
 Harrison, Rev. R., Cromford, near  
 Wirksworth  
 Harrison, W. Esq., Bath  
 Hartley, Mr. B., Rochdale  
 Hartley, Rev. J., Brentford  
 Harvey, G. R., Esq., Albany-road,  
 Camberwell  
 Haslam, Mr. W. Epping  
 Havard, Mr. J., Bedford  
 Hayden, Rev. J., High Wycombe  
 Haydon, W. Esq., Guildford  
 Hayes, Rev. J., Harpersbury  
 Haymes, Rev. J., Roade, Northampton  
 Haynes, Mr. A., Bradford  
 Heald, J. Esq., Manchester  
 Heape, Rev. R., Pontefract  
 Heathcoat, U. Esq., Shepalsbury, Herts  
 Heaton, Rev. J., West Bromwich  
 Heeley, Clement, Esq., Birmingham  
 Hemming, Rev. T., Kimbolton  
 Henderland, Rev. W., Taunton  
 Henderson, Rev. Dr., Highbury College  
 Herne, Mr. H., Dundee  
 Heudebourk, Rev. W. H., Tiverton  
 Hewlett, Rev. Dr., Coventry  
 Heynes, —, Esq., Cornwall  
 Hickson, Mr. T. M., Bannockburn  
 Higgs, Mr. W., Gloucester  
 Hill, Mr. J., Pendock, Upton-on-Severn  
 Hill, Rev. T. B., St. Stephen's, Islington  
 Himes, Rev. J. C., Gainsborough  
 Hindson, Mr. T. C., Gainsborough  
 Hoby, James, Esq., Lambeth  
 Hodgkins, Rev. B., Bishop's Stortford  
 Hodgman, Mr., Isle of Thanet

- Hodgson, A. Esq., Liverpool  
 Hodgson, Mr. J., Rotherham  
 Hodgson, Mr. W., Leigh  
 Hodgson, Rev. W. H., Manchester  
 Holden, Mr. H., Whitstable  
 Holgate, Rev. Israel, East India Road,  
 London  
 Holgate, Mr. J., Manchester  
 Holgate, Mr. S., Hulme, Manchester  
 Holdsworth, W. B. Esq., Leeds  
 Holland, Rev. K., St. Ives, Hunts  
 Holy, T. B., Esq., Sheffield  
 Hornby, Rev. J., Clitheroe  
 Horsfall, Mr., Ashton-under-Lyne  
 Horsfall, J. Esq., Fairbottom, Ashton-  
 under-Lyne  
 Horsham, Mr. J., Manchester  
 \*Horton, Rev. T., Devonport  
 Hoskins, Mr. Thomas, Gosport  
 Howard, Mr. J., Bedford  
 Hoyle, Mr., Rotherham  
 Hudswell, Mr. W., Leeds  
 Hugill, Rev. W., Worksop  
 Hull, W. W., Esq., Tavistock-square,  
 London  
 Humphreys, Mr. W., Dinton, Bucks  
 Hunt, Rev. R. T., Camberwell New-road  
 Hunter, Rev. H., Nottingham  
 Ingham, Geo. Esq., Barton  
 Ingham, Rev. J., Ilkestone  
 Ingram, G. Esq., West Mante  
 Ingram, Mr. G. W., Burton-on-Trent  
 Isott, Mr. J., Bedford  
 Jackson, Rev. G., Newbury  
 Jackson, Rev. T., Richmond, Surrey  
 James, J. Esq., Wrexham  
 James, Mr. T., Loughborough  
 James, Rev. D., Kirkdale, Liverpool  
 James, Rev. T., London  
 Jenkin, Rev. H. B., Greenwich  
 Jenkinson, Rev. J. T., Pimlico, London  
 Jeves, W. Esq., Hitchin  
 Jewell, Rev. T., Helston  
 Joges, Rev. T., Hitchin  
 Johnston, Mr. J., Gravesend  
 Johnston, Mr. J., London Wall  
 Johnson, James, Esq., Manchester  
 Johnson, Mr. J., Milton  
 Johnson, Mr. J., Whitstable  
 Jones, Rev. A., Chatham  
 Jones, Rev. E., Plymouth  
 Jones, E. W. Esq., Newport, Mon-  
 mouthshire  
 Jones, J. Esq., Manchester  
 Jones, J. G. Esq., Bradford, Wilts  
 Jones, Mr. W., Swansea  
 Jones, Mr. R., Merthyr Tydvil  
 Jones, Mr. R., Bangor, Wales  
 Jones, Rev. R., Rhymney and Tredegar  
 Jones, Rev. T. C., Liverpool  
 Jones, Rev. W., Frome  
 Jones, Mr. W., Mold, Flints  
 Jones, Mr. W., Ross  
 Jones, Rev. W., Swansea  
 Jordan, Mr. G., Luton  
 Jones, Mr. J. H., 5, County-terrace,  
 Camberwell New-road  
 Judd, W. P. Esq., Hamilton-place,  
 New-road, London  
 Jukes, Rev. J., Bedford  
 Kay, J. C. Esq., Bury, Lancashire  
 Kay, J. R. Esq., ditto  
 Keen, Rev. C. T., Worstead  
 Keith, Rev. D., Killeshee  
 Keighley, Mr., Halifax  
 Kelly, Rev. J., Killeshee  
 Kelly, Rev. J., Liverpool  
 Kelsall, H. Esq., Rochdale  
 Kershaw, J. Esq., Salford  
 Kidd, Rev. G. B., Scarborough  
 Killick, Mr., Bolton  
 Killick, H. Esq., Newbury  
 Killick, Mr. S., Mitcham  
 Kilpin, Mr., Orange-street Chapel,  
 London  
 King, Mr. R. W., Coningsby  
 King, Rev. T., Cranbrook  
 Kingston, Mr. F., Barbage  
 Kingston, Mr. T., Barlow  
 Kinnersley, E. Esq., Dunstable  
 Kirk, Mr. W., West Mante  
 Kirkland, Rev. H., Stamford-hill, Lon-  
 don  
 \*Kirtland, Rev. C., Newark  
 Kish, W. Esq., Leslie Town  
 \*Kitson, Mr. W., Brixton-hill  
 Knill, Rev. R., Wootton-under-Edge  
 Kniveton, Mr. F., Longton  
 Knowles, Mr., Bolton  
 Knowles, Rev. J., Dunstable

- Knowles, Rev. —, Wootton-under-Edge  
 Lamb, Rev. R. M., Over Darwen,  
 Blackburn  
 Lane, Thomas, Esq., Carlisle  
 Langford, W. Esq., Hitchin  
 Langford, Rev. Robert B., Colchester  
 Lansdale, Rev. H. W., Blackburn  
 Laud, Rev. T., Jotsham  
 Lawson, Rev. H., Castle Comer  
 Leach, Rev. J., Stockport  
 Learoyd, Rev. Amos, Boston  
 Ledowen, Mr., Whitstable  
 Lee, Mr. Thos., Isleham  
 Leech, E. Esq., Preston  
 Leechman, Rev. James, Irvine  
 Lees, Rev. J., Guildford  
 Leonard, Rev. A., Barton  
 Lewis, Mr. J., Leek  
 Lidgett, J. Esq., Spitalfields  
 Lidiard, W. B., Esq., Bath  
 Little, Rev. J., Stanhope-street Chapel,  
 London  
 Lobley, Mr. T., Dewsbury  
 Lockwood, Mr. Thos., Tadcaster  
 Lockyer, Mr. F., Manchester  
 Lomas, Rev. J., Chorlton-on-Medlock  
 Lowe, G. Esq., Finsbury  
 Lyon, Rev. J., Southwark  
 Macbrain, Mr. R. M., Sittingbourne  
 Magee, Ven. Archdeacon, Dublin  
 \*Manning, Rev. E., Shoreditch, Lon-  
 don  
 Manning, Mr. H. T., Pentonville, Lon-  
 don  
 Manning, T. Esq., Northampton  
 Marsden, Mr. G., Hulme, Manchester  
 Marsh, Rev. W., Fenny Stratford  
 Marsh, Rev. W., D.D., Leamington  
 Marsh, Rev. W., Hythe  
 Marshall, J. Esq., London Wall  
 Marshall, Mr. J., Stockport  
 Marshall, Mr. T., ditto  
 Marshall, J. Esq., Wednesbury  
 Mason, W. Esq., Greenock  
 Mason, Rev. J., City-road, London  
 Massie, Rev. Dr., Manchester  
 Mather, J. Esq., South Shields  
 Matheson, Rev. Dr., North Shields  
 Mawkes, Mr. Thos., Belper  
 Maxwell, Rev. R., Cambridge  
 Mayer, Mr. W. B., Helston  
 McAllen, Mr. D., Aberdeen  
 McClare, Mr. J., Northampton  
 McCrea, Rev. J. B., M.A., Windsor  
 McDonald, Rev. E., Blairgowrie, Perth-  
 shire  
 McDonald, Rev. G. B., Wakefield  
 McFarlane, Mr., Edinburgh  
 McGregor, Rev. J., Stranraer, N.B.  
 McGuire, Rev. J. H., Liverpool  
 McIntosh, E. Esq., Inverness  
 McIlvain, Mr. J., Greenock  
 McIlwain, Rev. W., Belfast  
 McKenzie, A. Esq., Southampton-row,  
 London  
 McLaren, J. Esq., Edinburgh  
 McLean, Rev. J., Edinburgh  
 McMicking, —, Esq., Bannockburn  
 McNeile, Rev. Hugh, Liverpool  
 McOwan, Rev. J., City-road, London  
 Mead, Mr. J., Kingsland, London  
 Meek, Mr. G. M., Manchester  
 Merry, W. Esq., Whitechapel  
 Metcalf, W. Esq., Yarmouth  
 Methley, Mr. J., Southampton  
 Miall, Mr. E., Bungay  
 Miall, Rev. J. G., Bradford, Yorks  
 Middleton, —, Esq., Loughborough  
 Milburn, W. Esq., Ashton-under-Lyne  
 Miller, Rev. E., Hammersmith  
 Miller, H. Esq., Thurso  
 \*Minshall, T. Esq., Oswestry  
 Minton, Rev. S., Stoke-upon-Trent  
 \*Mirams, Rev. J., Kennington  
 Monro, Rev. T., London  
 Moneypenny, Rev. J. J., Hadlow  
 Moinier, L. Esq., Jun., Hockliffe  
 Montgomery, Rev. R., Percy Episcopal  
 Chapel, London  
 Mood, Rev. J. L., Guildford  
 Moore, Rev. R., Rugby  
 \*Moore, Rev. T., Shadwell  
 Moore, Rev. W., Truro  
 Morgan, W. Esq., Usk  
 Morison, Rev. J., D.D., Chelsea  
 \*Morris, Rev. R., Burton-on-Trent  
 Morris, Mr. A. T., Fenny Stratford  
 Morris, Rev. T., Calverton  
 Moscrop, Mr. T., Bolton  
 Moss, Rev. D., Stoney Stratford

- Moss, R. Esq., Calverton  
 Mouat, J. Esq., Guildford  
 Moulton, Mr., Liberty of the Rolls,  
 London  
 Mountford, Rev. T., Camberwell  
 Mowbray, H. Esq., Northumberland-  
 street, Strand, London  
 Mowker, T. Esq., Belper  
 Mudie, Rev. G. D., Epping  
 \*Mummery, Rev. J. V., Tunbridge  
 Munden, Mr., Bolton  
 Murray, Rev. T., Altrincham  
 Myers, J. Esq., Filkings, Langford  
 Nash, Mr. J., Lambeth  
 Naylor, Jos. Esq., Preston  
 Naylor, Rev. W., Bradford, Yorkshire  
 Nelbey, Rev. Dr., Manchester  
 Nelson, Rev. J., Stockport  
 Nelson, W. Esq., Manchester  
 Newlands, Rev. J., Perth  
 Newman, Rev. J. T., Stroud  
 Newstead, Rev. R., Leeds  
 Newton, Mr., Stockport  
 Newton, Rev. Dr., Salford  
 Nicklins, E. Esq., Birmingham  
 Nicholson, Rev. S., Plymouth  
 Nicholson, Rev. W., London Wall  
 Nisbet, J. Esq., (Wick) Berners-street,  
 London  
 Nixon, Mr. G., Longton, Potteries  
 Nixon, Mr. G., Longford, ditto  
 Nixon, Rev. T., Shadwell  
 Noel, Hon. and Rev. B. W., Hornsey  
 Nugent, R. Esq., Farren Connel  
 Nye, Rev. E., Plymouth  
 Oddie, Rev. S., Ossett, Wakefield  
 O'Donnoghue, Major, Ledbury  
 Oldham, —, Esq., Hull  
 Oliver, Rev. D. A., Bromyard  
 Orton, Mr. J. M., Bolton  
 Osborn, Rev. G., Manchester  
 Osborn, Mr. G., Newport Pagnell  
 Osborn, Rev. J., Rotherhithe  
 Osborn, J. Esq., Rochester  
 Osborn, Mr. J., Woburn, Bedfordshire  
 Osler, Mr. R., Falmouth  
 Otter, J. Esq., Stokeham  
 Owen, Rev. D. A., Bromyard  
 Owen, Rev. E., Wendover  
 Owen, Rev. J. J., Castle Donnington  
 Paddon, Mr. G., Hitchin  
 Paddon, Rev. H., High Wycombe  
 Paine, Mr. J., Watlington, Haddingham  
 Palmer, Mr. W. E., Louth  
 Park, E. Esq., Preston  
 Parker, J. Esq., Pentonville  
 Parker, Rev. W., Leigh, Lancashire  
 Parnell, Mr. W., Manchester  
 Parritt, Mr. T., Hertford  
 Parrott, Rev. W., Sittingbourne  
 Parry, Mr. H., Ruthin, Wales  
 Parry, Rev. J., Manchester  
 Parry, Rev. W., Denbigh  
 Pascoe, W. Esq., Bodmin  
 Paton, Mr. A., Alloa, Scotland  
 Pattison, J. R. Esq., Launceston  
 Patterson, Rev. W., Manchester  
 Paul, G. R. Esq., Stroud  
 Paul, J. D. Esq., Strand  
 Paul, Mr. R., Edinburgh  
 Peake, Rev. H., Abergavenny  
 Pearce, Rev. J., Wrexham  
 Pearce, J. Esq., Woolwich  
 Pearce, Rev. S., Crewkerne  
 Pearce, F. Esq., Woolwich  
 Pearson, Rev. E., London  
 Peart, Mr. R., Birmingham  
 Peck, Mr. W. R., Loughborough  
 Peggs, Mr. Jas., Ilkeston, Derbyshire  
 Pengelly, Rev. J. C., City-road, London  
 Percy, Rev. J. W., Warwick  
 Peterson, Rev. W., Lambeth  
 Pewtress, Mr., Gravesend  
 Phillips, J. Esq., Mayor of Pontefract  
 Phillips, T. Esq., Haverfordwest  
 Phipps, Mr. W., Bath  
 Pike, Rev. J. G., Derby  
 Pike, Mr. John, Peckham  
 \*Pike, Rev. J. B., Shrewsbury  
 Pike, Rev. J. C., Wisbeach  
 Pilkington, Rev. J., Rayleigh  
 Pinchback, Mr. E. G., Battersea  
 Pinkerstone, Rev. G., Petherton  
 Pingree, R. Esq., Maidstone  
 Place, R. Esq., Leek  
 Pledge, Mr., Aberdeen  
 Polley, J. Jun., Esq., Maldon  
 Pope, Rev. A., Leamington  
 \*Pope, Rev. J. W., Dorchester  
 Posnet, Rev. L., Wigan

- Potter, C. Esq., Over Darwen, Lancashire
- Powell, Rev. T., Doncaster
- Powell, Mr. T., London
- Pratt, D. Esq., Lambeth
- Pratt, T. Esq., Mitcham
- Prest, Rev. C., St. George's East, London
- Price, Rev. E. T., Gravesend
- Price, Mr. J. G., Pendock
- Prior, Rev. H. E., Dublin
- Prout, Rev. E., Halstead
- Pugney, Mr. R., Maidstone
- Pulling, Rev. J., Deptford
- Pulmer, Mr. E., Loughborough
- Quick, Rev. H., Taunton
- Raby, Rev. J., Worksop
- Raffles, Rev. Dr., Liverpool
- Ramsey, G. Esq., London
- Randerson, Rev. J., Glossop
- Ray, Rev. R., Taunton
- Read, Mr. J., Plymouth
- Redwar, Rev. T., St. Thomas', Chancery-lane, London
- Reece, R. M., Esq., Furnival's-inn, London
- Reece, Rev. R., Margate
- Reece, Rev. T., Reigate
- \* Reed, Rev. A., D.D., Hackney, London
- Rees, Rev. D., Isleham
- Richards, Rev. J., Stourbridge
- Ridgway, J. Esq., Shelton, Newcastle-under-Lyne
- Richardson, Rev. J., Warrington
- Richardson, Mr. J., Kennington
- Riggall, Mr. F., Louth
- Roberts, Mr. C., Bourne
- Roberts, Rev. James, Birmingham
- Roberts, J. Esq., Denbigh
- Roberts, Rev. W., Aldermanbury, London
- Robertson, Rev. J., Edinburgh
- Robinson, Rev. J. T., St. Andrew's, Holborn, London
- Robinson, Rev. R., Luton
- Robinson, Mr. T., Bolton
- Robinson, Rev. T., Dover
- Rodson, Mr. W., Leigh
- Roe, Mr. C. H., Birmingham
- Rogers, Mr. J., Bromham, near Bedford
- \* Rolls, Mr. R. H., Banbury
- Rooke, J. Esq., Pentonville, London
- Ross, Rev. Dr., Jotsham
- Rossell, Rev. J., Neath
- Rothwell, P. Esq., Bolton, Lancashire
- Rowland, Rev. T., Rochdale
- Rowe, Rev. G. H., Newark
- Roy, Mr. A., Alloa, N.B.
- Rudd, Mr. M., Woolwich
- Rust, Rev. C. T., Colchester
- Rye, Mr. B., Plymouth
- Ryle, Rev. J. C., Stoneham, Suffolk
- Sank, Rev. E., United States
- Sandys, Rev. J., Islington
- Scales, Rev. T., Leeds
- Schofield, Mr. S., Manchester
- Scholes, Mr. C. R., Dewsbury
- Scott, Rev. G., Gravesend
- Scott, Rev. J., Cleckheaton
- Scott, Rev. T., Brabourne
- Seaborn, Rev. H. S., Limehouse, London
- Sedden, Rev. E., Moham, Cheshire
- Selby, Mr. C. W., Wareham
- Sercomb, J. C. Esq., Exeter
- Seton, Sir W. C., Bart., Aberdeen
- Sharp, J. Esq., Royston
- Sharp, W. A. Esq., Gainsborough
- Shaw, W. Esq., Wakefield
- Shipman, Rev. J., Belper
- Simmons, Rev. J. Olney
- Simmonds, Rev. S., Woolwich
- Simpson, Rev. S., Nottingham
- Simson, Rev. D., Aberdeen
- Sissison, Mr. W., Hull
- Skelton, Mr. J., Croydon
- Sleigh, Rev. Dr., Hammersmith
- Slight, Rev. B., Tunbridge Wells
- Slight, Rev. F., Stamford
- Small, W. Esq., Ramsgate
- Smellie, Rev. W., Stranraer, N.B.
- Smith, Sir Culling E., Bart., Bedwell-park
- Smith, Mr., Cambridge
- Smith, Rev. G., Poplar, London
- Smith, Rev. J., Greenock
- Smith, K. Esq., London
- Smith, Thos. Esq., Haslingden
- Smyth, T. M. Esq., Maldon
- Smyth, Mr. E.
- Smyth, Rev. Dr., Woolfardisworthy
- Smyth, T. P. Esq., London
- Smytham, J. Esq., M.D., Edinburgh
- Smytton, T. Esq., London



- Sneher, Rev. J. W., Kettering  
 Sockett, Rev. F. P., West Bromwich  
 Sorley, Rev. A., Arbroath  
 Sorrel, J. Esq., Leighton Buzzard  
 Souter, Mr. T., Castle Donnington  
 Spencer, Mr. G., Tunbridge  
 Spencer, Rev. W., Devonport  
 Spice, Mr. R. P., Fakenham  
 Spong, Mr. Jas., Kingsland  
 Spyer, Mr. W. G., Watlington  
 Squance, Rev. T. H., Spitalfields, London  
 Stainforth, Rev. R., Pontefract  
 Stamp, Rev. J. S., City-road, London  
 Stamp, Rev. W. W., Manchester  
 Stamper, Rev. T. G., Uxbridge  
 Standen, Mr. E., Tenterden  
 Stanley, Rev. J., Jun., Weymouth  
 Stanley, Rev. J., Bristol  
 Stanson, —, Esq., Hull  
 Staret, Mr. W., Barton  
 Stephens, R. Esq., Lonsdale-square, Islington  
 Stephens, Rev. D. R., Newport, Monmouthshire  
 Stephenson, Rev. W. B., Salford  
 Stevens, J. Esq., Bishops Stortford  
 Stevenson, Mr. W., Nottingham  
 Stewart, Rev. D., Stirling, N.B.  
 Stewart, J. Esq., London  
 Stockdale, Mr. R., Bolton  
 Stoke, Rev. J., Ely-place, London  
 Stokes, J. Esq., Wednesbury  
 Stone, Rev. —, London  
 Story, J. H. Esq., Fermanagh  
 Stout, W. Esq., Boston  
 Stovel, Rev. C., Prescott-street, London  
 Stowell, Rev. Hugh, Manchester  
 Strachan, Rev. A., Lincoln  
 Strong, Mr. A., Hammersmith  
 Strong, Mr. W. D., Maidenhead  
 Sturges, Mr. R. F., Birmingham  
 Styles, Rev. Dr., Foleshill, near Coventry  
 Sugden, Mr. F. W., Keighley  
 Sugden, Rev. J. M., London Missionary Society  
 Sumer, Rev. D., Wingham, Kent  
 Sumners, Rev. J., Olney  
 Suter, Mr. A. G., Halifax  
 Sutcliffe, Mr., Sowerby Bridge, Halifax  
 Sutcliffe, Mr. T. R., Huddersfield  
 \*Swaine, Mr. E., Craven Chapel, London  
 Swindles, G. Esq., Macclesfield  
 Silvester, Mr. J., West Bromwich  
 Symons, Mr. W., Dunster  
 Tadman, R. Esq., Gravesend  
 Tame, T. Esq., Woolwich  
 Talbot, Rev. J. B., London  
 Tarbotton, Rev. W., Totness  
 Tattersfield, Rev. J., Keighley  
 Taylor, J. Esq., Birmingham  
 Taylor, Rev. J., St. Andrew's, N.B.  
 Temple, Rev. W., Hertford  
 Thackray, Mr., Bradford  
 Thain, J. Esq., Blairgowrie, Perthshire  
 Thodey, Rev. S., Cambridge  
 Thomas, Mr. A., Caermarthen  
 Thomas, Rev. J. W., Watlington, near Tettsworth  
 Thompson, Thos. Esq., Bedford-square, London  
 Thompson, Mr. E., Barnsbury-terrace, Islington, London  
 Thompson, F. Esq., Desborough  
 Thompson, Rev. J. W., Perth  
 Thompson, M. Esq., West Mante  
 Thompson, T. H. Esq., Dublin  
 Thompson, Mr. W., Leslie Town, N.B.  
 Thompson, Mr. W. S., Desborough  
 Thorp, Rev. A. J., Chippenham  
 Thorp, Mr. J., Leigh  
 • Thurgood, Mr. R. D., Saffron Walden  
 Tice, Mr. W., Christ Church, Hants  
 Tindale, Mr. E., Grosvenor-place, Commercial-road, London  
 Tindall, Rev. S., Hammersmith  
 Tippetts, Rev. J., Gravesend  
 Titt, Mr. C. P., Broughton, Stockbridge  
 Todd, Mr. W., Bourne  
 Tombs, Mr. H., Lechlade, Gloucestersh.  
 Toomer, G. E. Esq., Wingham  
 Toomer, Rev. S. E., Preston-court, Wingham  
 Towler, Mr. E., Market Rasen  
 Towne, Mr. J., Melton Mowbray  
 Townley, Rev. H., Highbury-place, London  
 Townley, Mr. J., Highbury  
 Tranter, Rev. W., Alston, Cumberland  
 Trotter, Capt. J., St. Albans  
 Truman, Rev. S., Croydon

- Tucker, Mr. S., Rouen  
 Tucker, Rev. J. K., Bishops Stortford  
 Turner, Mr. J., Manchester  
 Turner, Rev. P. C., Richmond, Surrey  
 Turner, Rev. W., Preston  
 Tydeman, Mr. H. H., Chelmsford  
 Tyler, Rev. W., Mile-end  
 Underwood, Rev. W., Praed-st. Chapel,  
     Paddington  
 Uppleby, L. Esq., Barton-on-Humber  
 Uppleby, Mr. W., Wootton  
 Valance, Mr. J., Brighton  
 Vasey, Mr. G., Whitby  
 Vaughan, Rev. J., Olney  
 Vickers, Mr. A., Disley, Stockport  
 Venables, C. Esq., High Wycombe  
 Venables, J. Esq., Burslem  
 Vevers, Rev. W., Derby  
 Vine, Rev. J., Henley-on-Thames  
 Vine, Rev. J., Nottingham  
 Vines, Mr. J., Battersea  
 Viney, Rev. J., Bethnal-green  
 Wagstaff, S. Esq., West Bromwich  
 \*Wake, Rev. T. W., Markyate-street,  
     Herts  
 Walker, Mr. C., Rochdale  
 Walker, Rev. E., Birmingham  
 Warren, Mr. G., Oswestry  
 Walker, J. Esq., Bolton  
 Walker, J. Esq., Colne  
 Walker, Rev. J., Snaith  
 Walker, Rev. S. A., Dublin  
 Walker, Mr. W., Bolton  
 Walker, W. Esq., Bradford, Yorkshire  
 Wall, Mr. S., Ross  
 Waller, T. Esq., Luton  
 Wallis, —, Esq., Loughborough  
 Walsh, Rev. J., Scarborough  
 Wandersford, J. B. C. S. Esq., Castle-  
     comer  
 Ward, Capt. A., Rotherhithe  
 Ward, Rev. D., Islington  
 Ward, Rev. J., Staindrop, Barnard  
     Castle  
 Ward, Rev. E. L., Blendworth  
 Ward, Mr. S., Woodborough  
 Ward, Rev. A., Ware  
 Warlow, Mr. J., Haverfordwest  
 Watson, Mr. Chas., Leeds  
 Watson, Mr. Joseph, Leeds  
 Watson, Rev. J., Scarborough  
 Watts, Rev. J., Falmouth  
 Wayne, Rev. J. W., Hitchin  
 Weelton, Ingram, Esq., Colne  
 Welks, B. Esq., Lambeth  
 Weare, Rev. W., Epping  
 West, Rev. F. A., Leeds  
 West, J. Esq., Sydenham  
 Westlake, Rev. C., Manchester  
 Westwood, H. Esq., Lynn  
 Wheeler, Rev. J., Kettering  
 White, E. Esq., Halifax  
 White, E. Esq., Hereford  
 White, T. Esq., Hartley-row, Hants  
 White, Mr. T., Leeds  
 Whitehead, Mr. D., Bacup  
 Whitehouse, W. Esq., West Bromwich  
 Whittemore, Rev. J., Rushden, Higham  
     Ferrers  
 Whitewood, Mr. J. M., Halifax  
 Wigner, Rev. T., Lynn  
 Wilde, J. Esq., Hammersmith  
 Willcocks, J. Esq., Coalisland, County  
     Tyrone, Ireland  
 Wilkinson, J. Esq., Stockport  
 Wilkinson, Mr. T., Rochdale  
 Willans, Mr. W., Huddersfield  
 Williams, Mr., Truro  
 Williams, Mr. D., Lynn  
 Williams, Mr. D. Hirwarn, Merthyr  
     Tydvil  
 Williams, Rev. D., St. Bartholomew the  
     Great, London  
 Williams, Mr. J. D., Rhymney  
 Williams, Rev. J., Towersey, Thame,  
     Bucks  
 Willimy, Mr., Spitalfields  
 Wilson, Rev. D., Islington  
 Wilson, Rev. J., Stockport  
 Wilson, Rev. J., Whitby  
 Wilson, Mr. R., Newcastle-on-Tyne  
 Wilson, Rev. W., Staines  
 Winter, Mr. E., Epping  
 \*Winter, Rev. T., Bristol  
 Wintle, Mr. E., Epping  
 Wire, D. W. Esq., Moorgate, London  
 Withington, Rev. T., Mevagissey  
 Woolmer, Rev. T., Landport, Portsmouth  
 Wood, Mr. J., Ashton-under-Lyne  
 Wood, Mr. J., Edinburgh

Woodland, Rev. W., Woolwich	Wright, Rev. W., Huntingdon
Woodman, Rev. F. E., Mile-end	Yardley, Mr. J., Brighton
Woodroof, Rev. J., Olney	Yates, Mr. J., Birmingham
Woolley, F. F., Esq., Staley-bridge	Yates, Mr. R., Oldham
Worsley, H. F. Esq., Rugby	Young, Mr., Brighton
Wright, E. T. Esq., Bilston	*Young, Rev. B. C., Thrapston
Wright, Rev. G., Beccles	Young, Mr. J., Four Elms, Kent
Wright, Rev. J., Manchester	Young, Rev. R., Nottingham-street,
Wright, Rev. Jas., Latchford Parsonage,	Marylebone, London
Warrington	

## ABSTRACT AND ANALYSIS OF PLACES WHICH HAVE SENT DEPUTIES TO THE ANTI-MAYNOOTH CONFERENCE.

The number of places from which Deputies presented themselves ... ..	411
The number of Deputies ... ..	1039
The number of places out of the 411, which have Representatives in the House of Commons	127
The number of Deputies from those 127 places amounts to ... ..	769
The number of Deputies from London and suburbs (included in the 769)... ..	187

Of the 127 places which have Representatives; the undermentioned are,—

### From Scotland, eight places :—

Aberdeen	Leith
Dundee	Perth
Edinburgh	Stirling
Greenock	Wick

### In Wales the following five places :—

Caermarthen	Merthyr Tydvil
Denbigh	Swansea
Haverfordwest	

### Ireland :—

Belfast	Tralee
Dublin	Tyrone, County
Fermanagh, County	Youghal

Aberdeen (Scotland)...	8	Cambridge ... ..	4
Ashburton ... ..	2	Canterbury ... ..	2
Ashton-under-Lyne ... ..	7	Chatham ... ..	2
Banbury ... ..	5	Cheltenham ... ..	8
Bath ... ..	4	Chester ... ..	2
Bedford ... ..	6	Chippenham ... ..	2
Belfast (Ireland) ... ..	1	Christchurch, Hants. ... ..	4
Birmingham ... ..	14	Colchester ... ..	4
Blackburn ... ..	5	Denbigh (Wales) ... ..	3
Bodmin ... ..	3	Derby ... ..	3
Bolton ... ..	8	Devonport ... ..	4
Boston ... ..	6	Diss, Norfolk ... ..	2
Bradford, Yorkshire ... ..	9	Doncaster ... ..	2
Bridgewater ... ..	4	Dorchester ... ..	2
Brighton ... ..	5	Dover ... ..	5
Bristol ... ..	5	Dublin (Ireland)... ..	7
Buckingham ... ..	5	Dundee (Scotland) ... ..	3
Caermarthen (Wales) ... ..	2	Durham ... ..	3

Edinburgh (Scotland) ... ..	8	Portsmouth ... ..	4
Exeter ... ..	3	Reigate ... ..	3
Falmouth, &c. ... ..	2	Retford ... ..	3
Fermanagh, County (Ireland) ... ..	3	Richmond ... ..	3
Finsbury (see London)		Rochdale ... ..	3
Gloucester ... ..	3	Rochester ... ..	4
Grantham ... ..	5	Salford ... ..	7
Greenock (Scotland) ... ..	5	Scarborough ... ..	6
Grimby ... ..	4	Sheffield ... ..	5
Guildford ... ..	3	Shrewsbury ... ..	2
Halifax ... ..	3	South Shields ... ..	3
Haverfordwest (Wales) ... ..	3	Southampton ... ..	5
Hereford ... ..	9	Stamford ... ..	3
Hertford ... ..	6	Stirling (Scotland) ... ..	2
Huddersfield ... ..	13	Stockport ... ..	8
Hull ... ..	5	Stoke-on-Trent ... ..	3
Huntingdon ... ..	3	St. Alban's ... ..	2
Hythe ... ..	4	St. Ives ... ..	1
Lancaster ... ..	3	St. Mary-le-bone (see London)	
Launceston ... ..	3	Swansea (Wales) ... ..	3
Leeds ... ..	15	Taunton ... ..	6
Leith (Scotland) ... ..	3	Totnes ... ..	3
Lincoln ... ..	4	Tralee (Ireland) ... ..	4
Liverpool ... ..	15	Truro ... ..	4
London, including Finsbury, St. Mary-le-bone, Southwark, Westminster, &c. ... ..	187	Tyrone, County (Ireland) ... ..	1
Lyme Regis ... ..	2	Wakefield ... ..	5
Macclesfield ... ..	10	Wareham ... ..	2
Maidstone ... ..	2	Warrington ... ..	2
Maldon ... ..	5	Warwick ... ..	2
Manchester and its vicinity ... ..	102	Wells ... ..	2
Merthyr Tydvil (Wales) ... ..	2	Westbury ... ..	2
Newark ... ..	5	Westminster (see London)	
Newcastle-under-Lyne ... ..	2	Weymouth ... ..	2
Newcastle-on-Tyne ... ..	6	Whitby ... ..	2
Newport, Monmouth ... ..	2	Wick (Scotland) ... ..	2
Norwich ... ..	2	Wigan ... ..	5
Nottingham ... ..	11	Windsor ... ..	3
Oldham ... ..	2	Wolverhampton ... ..	3
Perth (Scotland) ... ..	4	Woolwich ... ..	6
Preston ... ..	7	Wycombe ... ..	2
Plymouth ... ..	8	Yarmouth ... ..	3
Pontefract ... ..	5	York ... ..	2
		Youghall (Ireland) ... ..	2

The Stranraer Deputation received commission, empowering them to represent the following Churches at the Meetings in London, and to act for them, in giving a decided and full opposition to the Maynooth Grant :—

1. United Secession Church ... ..	Annan
2. Free Church ... ..	Ruthwell
3. Relief Church ... ..	Waterbeck
4. Free Church ... ..	Kirkmahoe
5. Do. do. ... ..	Closeburn
6. Do. do. ... ..	Kirkbean and Southwick
7. Established Church ... ..	New Abbey
8. United Secession Church ... ..	Dairy in Galloway
9. Free Church ... ..	Auldgarth Bridge
10. Relief Church ... ..	Castledouglas
11. Free Church ... ..	Gatehouse
12. United Secession Church ... ..	Do.
13. Do. do. ... ..	Creetown
14. Reformed Presbyterian Church ... ..	Newton Stewart
15. Free Church ... ..	Kirkmaiden
16. Established Church ... ..	Portpatrick

Representing a great portion of Dumfries, Kirkcudbright, and Wigtown shires.













